00068291

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
Royal Asiatic Society.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Government of Maharashtra
on 30 January, 2020

HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY;

INCLUDING THAT OF

THE POPES

TO

THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

68291

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

VOLUME VI.

E-4-9

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

God
270
Mi V His
68291

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SIXTH VOLUME.

BOOK XIII.

CHAPTER I.

A.D.		PAGE
1378	The Conclave	3
	Tumults	4
	Election of Archbishop of Bari	7
	Coronation	8
	Character of Urban VI.	9
	Cardinals at Anagni	12
	Declaration against Urban VI.	ib.
	Clement VII. — Antipope — Schism	15

CHAPTER II.

THE RIVAL POPES.

	Acts of Urban — of Clement	18
1380	Successes of Urban	19
1381	Charles of Durazzo in Naples	20
1382	Death of Queen Joanna — Louis of Anjou	21
1383	The Pope at Naples — Butillo Prignano	23
1384	Quarrel of Charles and Urban	24
	Arrest of Cardinals	25
1385–6	Urban flies to Genoa	27
1386	Death of Charles of Durazzo	28
1389	Death of Urban VI.	30
	Clement VII. at Avignon	ib.

CHAPTER III.

BONIFACE IX. — BENEDICT XIII.

A.D.		PAGE
	Accession of Boniface IX.	33
	Simony — Annates — Nepotism	35, 6
1394	Death of Clement VII.	37
	Benedict XIII.	38
1393	Boniface IX. in Perugia	39
1399	In Rome	40
1400	Jubilee	41
	Gian Galeazzo of Milan	ib.
1395	Benedict XIII. — Council at Paris	42
	Peter d'Ailly	45
1398	Benedict besieged in Avignon	47
1398–1403	Imprisonment and flight	49
1404	Death of Boniface IX.	51

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT VII. — GREGORY XII. — BENEDICT XIII.

	Election of Innocent — Insurrection in Rome	52
	Ladislaus of Naples	53
1405	Death of Innocent	55
	Gregory XII.	ib.
1407	Meeting appointed at Savona	56
1407–8	Ladislaus in Rome	59
	Cardinals at Pisa	60
1408	Benedict flies to Spain	63

CHAPTER V.

COUNCIL OF PISA.

	Cardinals summon the Council	64
	Benedict's Council at Perpignan	66
	Gregory's Council	67
1409	Meeting of Council at Pisa	68
	Both Popes deposed	71
	Election of Alexander V.	74
	Bull in favour of the Friars	76
1410	Death of Alexander — Election of John XXIII.	80
	John XXIII. — Balthasar Cossa	ib.
1411	Crusade against Ladislaus	84
	Pope submits and again quarrels with Ladislaus	85
	Flies from Rome	87
1413	The Emperor Sigismund	88
	Council of Constance determined	91
1414	Death of Ladislaus	93

CHAPTER VI.

Wycliffe.

A.D.		PAGE
	Teutonic England	94
	Edward II.	95
	Wars of Edward III.	97
	Archbishop of Canterbury	98
1324	Birth of Wycliffe	100
	Wycliffe at Oxford	102
	Preferments	106
	Discussion on tribute to Rome	107
1371	Parliamentary Petition against Hierarchy	108
	William of Wykeham	109
1376	Wycliffe Commissioner at Bruges	112
	The Good Parliament	114
1377	Death of Edward III.	117
	Wycliffe at St. Paul's	ib.
	Proceedings against Wycliffe	120
	Wycliffite Teachers	122
	Translation of the Bible	123
1381	Insurrection of the Peasants	125
	Council at the Grey Friars, London	127
1382	Parliament at Oxford — Convocation	130
	Wycliffe at Lutterworth	131
	Crusade — Spencer Bishop of Norwich	133
1384	Death of Wycliffe	134

CHAPTER VII.

The Lollards.

	Queen Anne of Bohemia	138
	Petition of Lollards	140
1399	Accession of Henry IV.	141
1400	Statute de Hæretico Comburendo	143
	William Sautree Martyr	144
1409	Badbee and Thorpe	146
	Oldcastle, Lord Cobham	148
1417	His death	153

CHAPTER VIII.

Council of Constance.

1415	Assemblage	156
	Pope John XXIII.	158
	Frederick of Austria	159

CHAPTER VIII.—*continued.*

A.D.		PAGE
1415	John Huss	160
	Huss at Constance	169
	Huss in prison	171
	Arrival of the Emperor	172
	Number and Members of the Council	173

CHAPTER IX.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE—JOHN XXIII.—JOHN HUSS.

1416	Threatening Signs against the Pope	177
	The Emperor abandons John Huss	ib.
	Deputies from Antipopes	179
	Charges against the Pope	181
	Pope John's renunciation	183
	Flight of the Pope	189
	Gerson	190
	The Pope at Schaffhausen	191
	Proceedings of Council	193
	Surrender and Imprisonment of the Pope	196
	John Huss	197
	Examination	201
	Huss refuses to recant	206
	Sentence	209
	Execution	211
	Proceedings in Bohemia	212
	Jerome of Prague	214
	The three Johns—John XXIII., John Huss, Jean Petit	217

CHAPTER X.

CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE—POPE MARTIN V.

	Death of Robert Hallam	223
	Election of Martin V.	224
	Struggles for reform	227
	Concordats	228
	Dissolution of the Council	230
	Results	231
1419	Martin in Florence	232
1421	Martin in Rome—State of Rome	234
	Martin on Statute of Præmunire	237
1431	Death of Martin	240

CHAPTER XI.

Eugenius IV. — Hussite War.

A.D.		PAGE
	Election of Eugenius IV.	241
	Seizes Martin's Treasure	243
	Bohemian war	244
1419	Death of King Wenzel — Accession of Sigismund	246
1420–1	Ziska — Battles of Wyschebrad, Saaz, and Deutschbrod	247
1426	Procopius — Battle of Aussitz	249
1431	Invasion of Germany — Battle of Taass	250

CHAPTER XII.

Council of Basle.

	The Legate Julian Cæsarini	252
	State of Germany	254
	Emperor Sigismund in Italy	256
1433	Coronation	258
	Council declared lawful	259
1434	Eugenius flies from Rome	261
1433	Bohemians at Basle	263

CHAPTER XIII.

Council of Ferrara — The Greeks.

	Proposed Reconciliation of Greek Empire and Church	266
	Proceedings at Constantinople	269
1435	Council suspends the Pope	270
	The Emperor John Palæologus	ib.
	Fleets of the Pope and the Council	272
1437	The voyage	274
1438	Arrival at Venice	275
	Arrival at Ferrara	276
	Plague at Ferrara	279
	Journey to Florence	281
	France — Pragmatic Sanction — Synod of Bourges	282

CHAPTER XIV.

Council of Florence.

1438–9	Procession of the Holy Ghost	286
	Terms of Treaty	291
	Close of the Session	293
	Return of the Greeks to Constantinople	294

CHAPTER XV.

CONTINUATION OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE — POPE FELIX.

A.D.		PAGE
	Archbishop of Arles	297
1439	Deposition of Pope Eugenius	298
	Election of Pope Felix	299
1440	Coronation	302
	Neutrality of Germany — Diets	304

CHAPTER XVI.

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINI.—DISSOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE.

	Youth of Æneas	306
	Æneas in Scotland	309
	His morals	311
	Æneas at Basle	313
	Secretary to Pope Felix	317
	Secretary to the Emperor	318
	Æneas in Holy Orders	320
1444	Æneas Imperial Ambassador to Rome	322
	Æneas Secretary to the Pope	325
1446	Again at Rome	326
	Gregory of Heimburg	327
	Diet at Frankfort	328
1447	Death of Eugenius IV.	331

CHAPTER XVII.

NICOLAS V.

	Election of Nicolas V.	333
1449	Dissolution of Council of Basle—Abdication of Pope Felix	334
	Æneas in Milan	336
	Character of Nicolas V.	337
1450	Jubilee	339
1452	Coronation of the Emperor Frederick III.	343
	Conspiracy of Stephen Porcaro	345
	Taking of Constantinople	347
1454	Death of Nicolas V.	ib.
	Nicolas patron of letters and arts	349
	His buildings	353

BOOK XIV.

SURVEY.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
Clergy and Laity	357
Intellectual education of Clergy	359
Spiritual power	360
Monks and Friars	362
Property of Clergy — Tithe	364
Landed wealth	366
France — England	367–8
Doomsday	369
Valuation of Henry VIII.	371
Rent in money and kind	373
Oblations	375
Unity of the Clergy	376
Ubiquity of Clergy	379
Social effects	381
Charity	383
Morals of the Clergy	384
Power of Clergy — Italy	387
,, ,, France	389
,, ,, Spain — Germany	390
,, ,, England	391

CHAPTER II.

Belief of Latin Christianity.

The Creed	398
Popular religion	399
Angels	401
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite	402
Dæmonology	406
Satan	408
The Virgin	413
The Saints	416
Reliques	422
Hell	426
Purgatory	428
Heaven	430

CHAPTER III.

Latin Letters.

	PAGE
Theology	435
Earlier Schoolmen	436
Peter Lombard	437
Mystics	439
Arabic Philosophy	440
Aristotle	444
Translations of Aristotle	446
The Schoolmen	449
The five great Schoolmen—	
Albert the Great	452
Thomas Aquinas	458
S. Bonaventura	464
Duns Scotus	466
(Scotists and Thomists)	469
William of Ockham	470
Roger Bacon	475
The De Imitatione Christi	482

CHAPTER IV.

Christian Latin Poetry — History.

Latin Poetry — Paraphrases	486
Later Latin Poems	488
Lives of the Saints	490
Hymnology	491
Mysteries	493
Hroswitha	496
Anacreontic Songs	499
Satiric Poems	501
History	505

CHAPTER V.

Christian Letters in the New Languages of Europe.

French — Spanish — German — English	507
Provençal Poetry	509
Dante	510
Petrarch	516
Boccaccio	ib

CHAPTER VI.

PAGE
Language of France 519
The Normans 521
Poetry of Langue d'Oil — Trouvères 524
Memoirs 526

CHAPTER VII.

Teutonic Languages.

Christian terms original 527
The Anglo-Saxons 529
Conversion of Germany 530
The Normans 533
Piers Ploughman 535
Wycliffe's Bible 545
Chaucer . . . . . ib.
Germany 550
Preachers 553
John Tauler 554
Nicolas of Basle 557
Mysticism 559
Friends of God 561
German Theology 562

CHAPTER VIII.

Christian Architecture.

Architecture faithful to the Church 563
I. Roman Architecture 565
The Arch 567
Constantine the Great . . . . . ib.
Constantinople 569
II. Justinian 570
S. Sophia 571
Hierarchical Influence 573
The Church — The builders in the West . . . 575
Motives for church building 576
The Church the people's 579
III. Byzantine, Lombard, or Romanesque 580
IV. Norman architecture 583
V. Gothic architecture 584
The Gothic the consummation of church architecture 592
Symbolism 593

CHAPTER IX.

Christian Sculpture.

PAGE
Christian sculpture in the East 596
Proscribed in the East 597
Sculpture in the West 598
Architectural Sculpture 599
Monumental Sculpture 600

CHAPTER X.

Christian Painting.

The Catacombs 604
Types of the Saviour, &c. 606
Monks of St. Basil 607
Change in the tenth century . . . . . ib.
Mosaics 609
Dawn of Art 610
Giotto 612
Mendicant Orders 614
Frá Angelico 616
Transalpine painting 618
Art under Nicolas V. 619
Revolution begun under Nicolas V. 621
I. Progress of human intellect . . . . . ib.
II. Revival of Letters 623
III. Modern Languages 624
IV. Printing and paper 625
Conclusion 627

HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK XIII.

09
10

CHRONOLOGY OF BOOK XIII.

POPES.

A.D.		A.D.
1378	Urban VI.	1389
1378	Clement VII. (Anti-pope)	1394
1389	Boniface IX.	1404
1394	Benedict XIII. (Antipope).	1423
1404	Innocent VII.	1406
1406	Gregory XII.	1415
1409	(Council of Pisa) Alexander V.	1410
1410	John XXIII.	1415
1417	Martin V.	1431
1431	Eugenius IV.	1447
1439	Felix V. (Anti-pope)	1449
1447	Nicolas V.	1454

EMPERORS OF GERMANY.

A.D.		A.D.
1378	Wenceslaus	1400
1400	Rupert	1410
1410	Sigismund	1438
1438	Albert II. (of Austria)	1440
1440	Frederick III. (of Austria).	

KINGS OF FRANCE.

A.D.		A.D.
	Charles V.	1380
1380	Charles VI.	1422
1422	Charles VII.	

KINGS OF ENGLAND.

A.D.		A.D.
	Richard II.	1399
1399	Henry IV.	1413
1413	Henry V.	1422
1422	Henry VI.	

Archbishops of Canterbury.

	Simon Sudbury	1381
1381	William Courtenay.	
1397	Thomas Arundel.	
1398	Roger Walden (substitute).	
1398	Arundel	1414
1414	Henry Chicheley	1443
1443	John Stafford	1452
1452	John Kemp.	

KINGS OF SCOTLAND.

A.D.		A.D.
	Robert II.	1390
1390	Robert III.	1406
1406	James I.	1438
1438	James II.	

KINGS OF NAPLES.

A.D.		A.D.
	Joanna	1382
1382	Charles III. (of Durazzo)	1386
1386	Ladislaus	1414
1414	Joanna	1434
1434	Alfonso (of Arragon).	

KINGS OF SPAIN.

A.D.		A.D.
	Castile.	
	Henry II.	1379
1379	John I.	1390
1390	Henry III.	1406
1406	John II.	1452
	Arragon.	
	Peter IV.	1387
1387	John I.	1395
1395	Martin	1410
1410	Ferdinand	1415
1415	Alfonso V.	

KINGS OF PORTUGAL.

A.D.		A.D.
	Ferdinand	1383
1385	John I.	1433
1433	Edward.	
1438	Alfonso V.	

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

A.D.		A.D.
	John V. Palæologus	1391
1391	Manuel.	1424
1424	John VI.	1448
1448	Constantine.	

OTTOMAN EMPERORS.

A.D.		A.D.
	Amurat I.	1389
1389	Bajazet I.	1403
1403	Soliman	1410
1410	Musa	1413
1413	Mahomet I.	1421
1421	Amurat II.	1450
1450	Mahomet II.	

BOOK XIII.

CHAPTER I.

THE SCHISM.

GREGORY XI. had hardly expired when Rome burst out into a furious tumult. A Roman Pope, at least an Italian Pope, was the universal outcry. The Conclave must be overawed; the hateful domination of a foreign, a French Pontiff must be broken up, and for ever. This was not unforeseen. Before his death Gregory XI. had issued a Bull,[a] conferring the amplest powers on the Cardinals to choose, according to their wisdom, the time and the place for the election. It manifestly contemplated their retreat from the turbulent streets of Rome to some place where their deliberations would not be overborne, and the predominant French interest would maintain its superiority. On the other hand there were serious and not groundless apprehensions that the fierce Breton and Gascon bands, at the command of the French Cardinals, might dictate to the Conclave. The Romans not only armed their civic troops, but sent to Tivoli, Velletri, and the neighbouring cities; a strong force was mustered to keep the foreigners in check. Throughout the interval between the funeral of Gregory and the opening of the Conclave, the Cardinals were either too jealously watched, or thought it imprudent to attempt flight. Sixteen Cardinals were present at Rome,[b] one Spaniard,

March 27, 1378.

The Conclave.

[a] The Bull in Raynald. 1378.

[b] See in Sismondi, Répub. Ital. vii. p. 107 (or in Ciacconius), the list of the Cardinals, and their titles. Sismondi throughout has followed Thomas de Acerno. But perhaps Acerno's account is rather suspicious, as his object was to prove the legitimacy of the election of Urban VI. This was supposed to depend on the election not having been compulsory; but if one thing be clear, it is that the majority would have preferred a French Pope.—Baluz. in Not. p. 1065.

eleven French, four Italians.[c] The ordinary measures were taken for opening the Conclave in the palace near St. Peter's. Five Romans, two ecclesiastics and three laymen, and three Frenchmen were appointed to wait upon and to guard the Conclave. The Bishop of Marseilles represented the great Chamberlain, who holds the supreme authority during the vacancy of the Popedom. The Chamberlain the Archbishop of Arles, brother of the Cardinal of Limoges, had withdrawn into the Castle of St. Angelo, to secure his own person, and to occupy that important fortress.

April 7.

The nine solemn days fully elapsed, on the 7th of April they assembled for the Conclave. At that instant (inauspicious omen!) a terrible flash of lightning, followed by a stunning peal of thunder, struck through the hall, burning and splitting some of the furniture. The Hall of Conclave was crowded by a fierce rabble, who refused to retire. After about an hour's strife, the Bishop of Marseilles, by threats, by persuasion, or by entreaty, had expelled all but about forty wild men, armed to the teeth. These ruffians rudely and insolently searched the whole building; they looked under the beds, they examined the places of retreat. They would satisfy themselves whether any armed men were concealed, whether there was any hole, or even drain through which the Cardinals could escape. All the time they shouted, "A Roman Pope! we will have a Roman Pope!" Those without echoed back the savage yell.[d] Before long appeared two ecclesiastics, announcing themselves as delegated by the commonalty of Rome: they demanded to speak with the Cardinals. The Cardinals dared not refuse. The Romans represented, in firm but not disrespectful language, that for seventy years the holy Roman people had been without their pastor, the supreme head of Christendom. In Rome were many noble and wise ecclesiastics equal to govern the Church: if not in Rome, there were such men

Roman delegates.

[c] Orsini, Florence, Milan, St. Peter's.

[d] The accounts of this remarkable transaction are perhaps less contradictory than at first appears. Some are from eye-witnesses, or from persons in the confidence of one or other of the Cardinals. That in the second Life of Gregory XI. (apud Baluzium) has to me strong internal marks of truth in its minuteness and graphic reality.

in Italy. They intimated that so great was the fury and determination of the people, that if the Conclave should resist, there might be a general massacre, in which probably they themselves, assuredly the Cardinals, would perish. The Cardinals might hear from every quarter around them the cry, "A Roman Pope! if not a Roman, an Italian!" The Cardinals replied, that such aged and reverend men must know the rules of the Conclave; that no election could be by requisition, favour, fear, or tumult, but by the interposition of the Holy Ghost. To reiterated persuasions and menaces they only said, "We are in your power; you may kill us, but we must act according to God's ordinance. To-morrow we celebrate the Mass for the descent of the Holy Ghost; as the Holy Ghost directs, so shall we do." "Some of the French uttered words which sounded like defiance. The populace cried, "If ye persist to do despite to Christ, if we have not a Roman Pope, we will hew these Cardinals and Frenchmen in pieces." At length the Bishop of Marseilles was able entirely to clear the hall. The Cardinals sat down to a plentiful repast; the doors were finally closed. But all the night through they heard in the streets the unceasing clamour, "A Roman Pope, a Roman Pope!" Towards the morning the tumult became more fierce and dense. Strange men had burst into the belfry of St. Peter's; the clanging bells tolled as if all Rome was on fire.

Within the Conclave the tumult, if less loud and clamorous, was hardly less general. The confusion without and terror within did not allay the angry rivalry, or suspend that subtle play of policy peculiar to the form of election. The French interest was divided; within this circle there was another circle. The single diocese of Limoges, favoured as it had been by more than one Pope, had almost strength to dictate to the Conclave. The Limousins put forward the Cardinal de S. Eustache. Against these the leader was the Cardinal Robert of Geneva, whose fierce and haughty demeanour and sanguinary acts as Legate had brought so much of its unpopularity on the administration of Gregory XI. With

Robert were the four Italians, and three French Cardinals.[e] Rather than a Limousin, Robert would even consent to an Italian. They on the one side, the Limousins on the other, had met secretly before the Conclave: the eight had sworn not on any account to submit to the election of a traitorous Limousin.[f]

All the sleepless night the Cardinals might hear the din at the gate, the yells of the people, the tolling of the bells. There was constant passing and repassing from each other's chambers, intrigues, altercations, manœuvres, proposals advanced and rejected, promises of support given and withdrawn. Many names were put up. Of the Romans within the Conclave two only were named, the old Cardinal of St. Peter's, the Cardinal Jacobo Orsini. The Limousins advanced in turn almost every one of their faction; no one but himself thought of Robert of Geneva.

In the morning the disturbance without waxed more terrible. A vain attempt was made to address the populace by the three Cardinal Priors; they were driven from the windows with loud derisive shouts, "A Roman! a Roman!" For now the alternative of an Italian had been abandoned; a Roman, none but a Roman, would content the people. The madness of intoxication was added to the madness of popular fury. The rabble had broken open the Pope's cellar, and drunk his rich wines.[g] In the Conclave the wildest projects were started. The Cardinal Orsini's was to dress up a Minorite Friar (probably a Spiritual) in the Papal robes, to show him to the people, and so for themselves to effect their escape to some safe place, and proceed to a legitimate election. The Cardinals, from honour or from fear, shrunk from this trick.

At length both parties seemed to concur. Each claimed credit for first advancing the name, which most afterwards

[e] There were five,—Limoges, Agrefeuille, Poitou, Majoris Monasterii (St. Martin in Tours), and De Verny.

[f] See in Raynaldus the statement of the Bishop of Cassano, the confidential friend of Robert of Geneva.

[g] "Sitibundi et sitientes, volentes bibere de bono vino Papali, aperuerunt cellarium Domini Papæ, in quo erant vina Græca, Garnaria, Malvoisia, et diversa alia vina bona."—Thomas de Acerno, apud Murator. iii.

repudiated, of the Archbishop of Bari, a man of repute for theologic and legal erudition, an Italian, but a subject of the Queen of Naples, who was also Countess of Provence. They came to the nomination. The Cardinal of Florence proposed the Cardinal of St. Peter's. The Cardinal of Limoges arose, "The Cardinal of St. Peter's is too old. The Cardinal of Florence is of a city at war with the Holy See. I reject the Cardinal of Milan as the subject of the Visconti, the most deadly enemy of the Church. The Cardinal Orsini is too young, and we must not yield to the clamour of the Romans. I vote for Bartholomew Prignani, Archbishop of Bari."[h] All was acclamation; Orsini alone stood out: he aspired to be the Pope of the Romans. Archbishop of Bari.

But it was too late; the mob was thundering at the gates, menacing death to the Cardinals, if they had not immediately a Roman Pontiff. The feeble defences sounded as if they were shattering down; the tramp of the populace was almost heard within the Hall. They forced or persuaded the aged Cardinal of St. Peter's to make a desperate effort to save their lives. He appeared at the window, hastily attired in what either was or seemed to be the Papal stole and mitre. There was a jubilant and triumphant cry, "We have a Roman Pope, the Cardinal of St. Peter's. Long live Rome! Long live St. Peter!" The populace became even more frantic with joy than before with wrath. One band hastened to the Cardinal's palace, and, according to the strange usage, broke in, threw the furniture into the streets, and sacked it from top to bottom. Those around the Hall of Conclave, aided by the connivance of some of the Cardinals' servants within, or by more violent efforts of their own, burst in in all quarters. The supposed Pope was surrounded by eager adorers; they were at his feet; they pressed his swollen, gouty hands till he shrieked from pain, and began to protest, in the strongest language, that he was not the Pope.

The indignation of the populace at this disappointment

[h] A Niem says, "Per electionem uniformem scilicet nemine eorum discrepante."—De Schism., c. 11.

was aggravated by an unlucky confusion of names. The Archbishop was mistaken for John of Bari, of the bed-chamber of the late Pope, a man of harsh manners and dissolute life, an object of general hatred.[1] Five of the Cardinals, Robert of Geneva, Acquasparta, Viviers, Poitou, and De Verny, were seized in their attempt to steal away, and driven back, amid contemptuous hootings, by personal violence. Night came on again; the populace, having pillaged all the provisions in the Conclave, grew weary of their own excesses. The Cardinals fled on all sides. Four left the city; Orsini and S. Eustache escaped to Vicovaro, Robert of Geneva to Zagarolo, St. Angelo to Guardia; six, Limoges, D'Aigrefeuille, Poitou, Viviers, Brittany, and Marmoutiers, to the Castle of St. Angelo; Florence, Milan, Montmayeur, Glandève, and Luna, to their own strong fortresses.

The Pope lay concealed in the Vatican. In the morning the five Cardinals in Rome assembled round him. A message was sent to the Bannerets of Rome, announcing his election. The six Cardinals in St. Angelo were summoned; they were hardly persuaded to leave their place of security; but without their presence the Archbishop would not declare his assent to his elevation. The Cardinal of Florence, as Dean, presented the Pope Elect to the Sacred College, and discoursed on the text, "Such ought he to be, an undefiled High Priest."

Election confirmed.

April 9. The Archbishop began a long harangue, "Fear and trembling have come upon me, the horror of great darkness." The Cardinal of Florence cut short the ill-timed sermon, demanding whether he accepted the Pontificate. The Archbishop gave his assent; he took the name of Urban VI. Te Deum was intoned; he was lifted to the throne. The fugitives returned to Rome.

Coronation. April 18. Urban VI. was crowned on Easter Day, in the Church of St. John Lateran. All the Cardinals were present at the august ceremony. They announced the election of Urban VI. to their brethren who had

[1] "Jo. de Bari vulgariter nuncupatum, Gallicum seu de terrâ Lemovicensi oriendum, satis, ut fama erat, superbum, pariter et lasciyum." — A Niem, c. 11.

remained in Avignon.[k] Urban himself addressed the usual encyclic letters, proclaiming his elevation, to all the Prelates in Christendom.

None but He who could read the hearts of men could determine how far the nomination of the Archbishop of Bari was free and uncontrolled by the terrors of the raging populace; but the acknowledgment of Urban VI. by all the Cardinals, at his inauguration in the holy office—their assistance at his coronation without protest, when some at least might have been safe beyond the walls of Rome—their acceptance of honours, as by the Cardinals of Limoges, Poitou, and Aigrefeuille—the homage of all[m]—might seem to annul all possible irregularity in the election, to confirm irrefragably the legitimacy of his title.

Not many days had passed, when the Cardinals began to look with dismay and bitter repentance on their own work. "In Urban VI.," said a writer of these times[n] (on the side of Urban as rightful Pontiff), "was verified the proverb — None is so insolent as a low man suddenly raised to power." The high-born, haughty, luxurious Prelates, both French and Italian, found that they had set over themselves a master resolved not only to redress the flagrant and inveterate abuses of the College and of the Hierarchy, but also to force on his reforms in the most hasty and insulting way. He did the harshest things in the harshest manner.

The Archbishop of Bari, of mean birth, had risen by the virtues of a monk. He was studious, austere, humble,[o] a diligent reader of the Bible,[p] master of the canon law, rigid in his fasts; he wore haircloth next his skin. His time was divided between study, prayer, and business, for which he had great aptitude. From the poor bishopric of Acherontia he had been promoted to

Character of Urban VI.

[k] See in Raynaldus the letter and signatures.

[m] The Cardinal of Amiens, absent as Legate in Tuscany, came to Rome to do homage to the Pope.—Raynald. sub ann. No. xx.

[n] Theodore à Niem, De Schism. l. i. c. 7.

[o] "Ante Papatum homo humilis et devotus, et retrahens manus suas ab omni munere, inimicus et persecutor symoniarum, zelator caritatis et justitiæ, sed nimis suæ prudentiæ innitendo et credens adulatoribus," &c.

[p] In person he was "brevis staturæ et spissus, coloris lividi sive fusci."—A Niem, liv. i. ch. i. He often before his papacy made à Niem read the Bible to him till he fell asleep.

the archbishopric of Bari, and had presided over the Papal Chancery in Avignon. The Monk broke out at once on his elevation in the utmost rudeness and rigour, but the humility changed to the most offensive haughtiness. Almost his first act was a public rebuke in his chapel to all the Bishops present for their desertion of their dioceses. He called them perjured traitors.[q] The Bishop of Pampeluna boldly repelled the charge; he was at Rome, he said, on the affairs of his see. In the full Consistory Urban preached on the text "I am the good Shepherd," and inveighed in a manner not to be mistaken against the wealth and luxury of the Cardinals. Their voluptuous banquets were notorious (Petrarch had declaimed against them). The Pope threatened a sumptuary law, that they should have but one dish at their table: it was the rule of his own Order. He was determined to extirpate simony. A Cardinal who should receive presents he menaced with excommunication. He affected to despise wealth. "Thy money perish with thee!" he said to a collector of the Papal revenue. He disdained to conceal the most unpopular schemes; he declared his intention not to leave Rome. To the petition of the Bannerets of Rome for a promotion of Cardinals, he openly avowed his design to make so large a nomination that the Italians should resume their ascendancy over the Ultramontanes. The Cardinal of Geneva turned pale, and left the Consistory. Urban declared himself determined to do equal justice between man and man, between the Kings of France and England. The French Cardinals, and those in the pay of France, heard this with great indignation.[r]

The manners of Urban were even more offensive than his acts. "Hold your tongue!" "You have talked long enough!" were his common phrases to his mitred counsellors. He called the Cardinal Orsini a fool. He charged the Cardinal of S. Marcellus (of Amiens), on his return from his legation in Tuscany, with having robbed the treasures of the Church. The charge was not less insulting for its justice. The Cardinal of Amiens, instead of allaying the feuds of France and England, which it was

[q] "Me præsente," writes à Niem, c. 111. [r] Raynaldus, sub ann.

his holy mission to allay, had inflamed them in order to glut his own insatiable avarice by draining the wealth of both countries in the Pope's name.[s] "As Archbishop of Bari, you lie," was the reply of the high-born Frenchman. On one occasion such high words passed with the Cardinal of Limoges, that but for the interposition of another Cardinal the Pope would have rushed on him, and there had been a personal conflict.[t]

Such were among the stories of the time. Friends and foes agree in attributing the schism, at least the immediate schism, to the imprudent zeal, the imperiousness, the ungovernable temper of Pope Urban.[u] The Cardinals among themselves talked of him as mad;[x] they began to murmur that it was a compulsory, therefore invalid, election.[y]

The French Cardinals were now at Anagni: they were joined by the Cardinal of Amiens, who had taken no part in the election, but who was burning under the insulting words of the Pope, perhaps not too eager to render an account of his legation. The Pope retired to Tivoli; he summoned the Cardinals to that city. They answered that they had gone to large expenses in laying in provisions and making preparations for their residence in Anagni; they had no means to supply a second sojourn in Tivoli. The Pope, with his four Italian Cardinals,

[s] So writes Walsingham:—"Cum sæpius missus fuisset a Papâ Gregorio prædecessore suo, ut quoquomodo pacem inter Angliæ et Franciæ regna firmaret, et ipse inestimabiles auri et argenti summas, pro labore sui itineris jussu Papæ de utroque regno cepisset, omisso suæ legationis officio non curavit paci providere regnorum, sed potius elaboravit, ut dissentiones et odia continuarentur inter reges diutius, et dum ipse descenderet taliter sub umbrâ firmandæ concordiæ, rediretque multotiens infecto negotio, suo provideret uberius nefando marsupio de male quæsitâ pecuniâ relevatâ de Christi patrimonio, utroque regno sophisticè spoliato."—Walsingham, p. 216.

[t] Baluz., note, p. 1067.

[u] "Talis fuit Dominus noster post coronationem suam asper et rigorosus, nescitur tamen, utrum ex divinâ voluntate, quum certè ante creationem suam fuerit multum humilis, amabilis et benignus."—A Niem.

[x] This account of Thomas di Acerno, Bishop of Luceria, is as it were the official statement of Urban's party, which accompanied the letter to the King of Castile.

[y] Thomas di Acerno gives six causes for the alienation of the Cardinals: I. The sumptuary limitation of their meals. II. The prohibition of simony of all kinds under pain of excommunication: this included the Cardinals. III. His projected promotion of Cardinals. IV. The determination to remain at Rome. V. His insulting demeanour and language to the Cardinals. VI. His refusal to go to Anagni, and his summons to Tivoli.

passed two important acts as Sovereign Pontiff. He confirmed the election of Wenceslaus, son of Charles IV., to the Empire; he completed the treaty with Florence by which the Republic paid a large sum to the See of Rome. The amount was 70,000 florins in the course of the year, 180,000 in four years, for the expenses of the war. They were relieved from ecclesiastical censures, under which this enlightened Republic, though Italian, trembled, even from a Pope of doubtful title. Their awe showed perhaps the weakness and dissensions in Florence rather than the Papal power.

July 20. The Cardinals at Anagni sent a summons to their brethren inviting them to share in their counsels concerning the compulsory election of the successor to Gregory XI. Already the opinions of great legists had been taken; some of them, that of the famous Baldus,[z] may still be read. He was in favour of the validity of the election.

But grave legal arguments and ecclesiastical logic were not to decide a contest which had stirred so deeply the passions and interests of two great factions. France and Italy were at strife for the Popedom. The Ultramontane Cardinals would not tamely abandon a power which had given them rank, wealth, luxury, virtually the spiritual supremacy of the world, for seventy years. Italy, Rome, would not forego the golden opportunity of resuming the long-lost authority. On the 9th August the Cardinals at Anagni publicly declared, they announced in encyclic letters addressed to the faithful in all Christendom, that the election of Urban VI. was carried by force and the fear of death; that through the same force and fear he had been inaugurated, enthroned, and crowned; that he was an apostate, an accursed Antichrist. They pronounced him a tyrannical usurper of the Popedom, a wolf that had stolen into the fold. They called upon him to descend at once from the throne which he occupied without canonical title; if repentant, he might find mercy; if he persisted, he would provoke the indigna-

Declaration of Cardinals at Anagni.

[z] Opera Baldi, vol. vi., and summarily in Raynaldus, sub ann. 1738, c. xxxvi.

tion of God, of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the Saints, for his violation of the Spouse of Christ, the common Mother of the Faithful.[a] It was signed by thirteen Cardinals. The more pious and devout were shocked at this avowal of cowardice; Cardinals who would not be martyrs in the cause of truth and of spiritual freedom condemned themselves.

But letters and appeals to the judgement of the world, and awful maledictions, were not their only resources. The fierce Breton bands were used to march and to be indulged in their worst excesses under the banner of the Cardinal of Geneva. As Ultramontanists it was their interest, their inclination, to espouse the Ultramontane cause. They arrayed themselves to advance and join the Cardinals at Anagni. The Romans rose to oppose them; a fight took place near the Ponte Salario, three hundred Romans lay dead on the field.

Imprudent acts of Urban VI.

Urban VI. was as blind to cautious temporal as to cautious ecclesiastical policy. Every act of the Pope raised him up new enemies. Joanna, Queen of Naples, had hailed the elevation of her subject the Archbishop of Bari. Naples had been brilliantly illuminated. Shiploads of fruit and wines, and the more solid gift of 20,000 florins, had been her oblations to the Pope. Her husband, Otho of Brunswick, had gone to Rome to pay his personal homage. His object was to determine in his own favour the succession to the realm. The reception of Otho was cold and repulsive; he returned in disgust.[b] The Queen eagerly listened to suspicions, skilfully awakened, that Urban meditated the resumption of the fief of Naples, and its grant to the rival House of Hungary. She became the sworn ally of the Cardinals at Anagni. Honorato Gaetani, Count of Fondi, one of the most turbulent barons of the land, demanded of the Pontiff 20,000 florins advanced on loan to Gregory XI. Urban not only rejected the claim, declaring it a personal debt of the late Pope, not of the Holy See, he also deprived Gaetani of his fief,

[a] Document in Raynaldus, and in the Gersoniana.
[b] A Niem, i. c. vi.

and granted it to his mortal enemy, the Count San Severino. Gaetani began immediately to seize the adjacent castles in Campania, and invited the Cardinals to his stronghold at Fondi. The Archbishop of Arles, Chamberlain of the late Pope, leaving the Castle of St. Angelo under the guard of a commander who long refused all orders from Pope Urban, brought to Anagni the jewels and ornaments of the Papacy, which had been carried for security to St. Angelo. The Prefect of the city, De Vico, Lord of Viterbo, had been won over by the Cardinal of Amiens.

The four Italian Cardinals still adhered to Pope Urban. They laboured hard to mediate between the conflicting parties. Conferences were held at Zagarolo and other places; when the French Cardinals had retired to Fondi, the Italians took up their quarters at Subiaco. The Cardinal of St. Peter's, worn out with age and trouble, withdrew to Rome, and soon after died. He left a testamentary document declaring the validity of the election of Urban. The French Cardinals had declared the election void; they were debating the next step. Some suggested the appointment of a coadjutor. They were now sure of the support of the King of France, who would not easily surrender his influence over a Pope at Avignon, and of the Queen of Naples, estranged by the pride of Urban, and secretly stimulated by the Cardinal Orsini, who had not forgiven his own loss of the tiara. Yet even now they seemed to shrink from the creation of an Anti-pope. Urban precipitated and made inevitable this disastrous event. He was now alone;[c] the Cardinal of St. Peter's was dead; Florence, Milan, and the Orsini stood aloof; they seemed only to wait to be thrown off by Urban, to join the adverse faction. Urban at first declared his intention to create nine Cardinals; he proceeded at once, and without warning, to create twenty-six.[d] By this step the French and Italian Cardinals together were now but an insignificant minority. They were instantly one. All must be risked, or all lost.

Aug. 20.

[c] Like a sparrow on the house-top.—A Niem, i. xi.

[d] Some authorities give twenty-nine.

On September 20, at Fondi, Robert of Geneva was elected Pope in the presence of all the Cardinals (except St. Peter's) who had chosen, inaugurated, enthroned, and for a time obeyed Urban VI. The Italians refused to give their suffrages, but entered no protest. They retired into their castles, and remained aloof from the schism. Orsini died before long at Tagliacozzo. The qualifications which, according to his partial biographer, recommended the Cardinal of Geneva, were rather those of a successor to John Hawkwood or to a Duke of Milan, than of the Apostles. Extraordinary activity of body and endurance of fatigue, courage which would hazard his life to put down the intrusive Pope, sagacity and experience in the temporal affairs of the Church; high birth, through which he was allied with most of the royal and princely houses of Europe: of austerity, devotion, learning, holiness, charity, not a word.[e] He took the name of Clement VII.: the Italians bitterly taunted the mockery of this name, assumed by the Captain of the Breton Free Companies—by the author, it was believed, of the massacre at Cesena.[f] Or Quatuor Tempora, Sept. 16. Clement VII.

So began the Schism which divided Western Christendom for thirty-eight years. Italy, excepting the kingdom of Joanna of Naples, adhered to her native Pontiff; Germany and Bohemia to the Pontiff who had recognised King Wenceslaus as Emperor; England to the Pontiff hostile to France;[g] Hungary to the Pontiff who might support her pretensions to Naples; Poland and the Northern kingdoms, with Portugal, espoused the same cause. France at first stood almost alone in support of her subject, of a Pope at Avignon instead of at Rome. Scot- Schism. 1375-1413.

[e] Vit. I. apud Baluzium. A Niem agrees, and adds: "Unde potest elici, quod illa electio a Spiritu Sancto et puris conscientiis non processit."

[f] Collutius Pierius, apud Raynald. No. lvi.

[g] Selden, in his Table Talk, says: "There was once, I am sure, a Parliamentary Pope. Pope Urban was made Pope in England by Act of Parliament, against Pope Clement: the Act is not in the Book of Statutes, either because he that compiled the book would not have the name of the Pope there, or else he would not let it appear that they meddled with any such thing; but it is upon the Rolls."—Artic. "Pope." Compare Walsingham. Ambassadors for both were in England. "Domino Deo favente repulsi sunt apostatici, admissi Papales."—P. 215.

land only was with Clement, because England was with Urban. So Flanders was with Urban because France was with Clement.[h] The uncommon abilities of Peter di Luna, the Spanish Cardinal (afterwards better known under a higher title), detached successively the Spanish kingdoms, Castile, Arragon, and Navarre, from allegiance to Pope Urban.

[h] "Exinde quanto plus divisi principes patronos sibi dilectos grato venerabantur aspectu, in eis plus excrescebat superbia et pertinacia dominandi, dum unus Alemanniam, Hungariam, Angliam et Hispaniam, sibi subditas cerneret, alter in Galliæ dulcissimo sinu foveretur, ditaretur, et ejus deffenderetur viribus." —Relig. de St. Denys, i. p. 80.

CHAPTER II.

THE RIVAL POPES.

NEITHER of these Popes were men whom religious enthusiasm could raise into an idol; they were men rather from whom profound devotional feeling could not but turn away abashed and confused. If the hard and arrogant demeanour of Urban might be excused when displayed only to the insolent and overbearing French Cardinals, or even justified as the severity of a Reformer of the Church, his subsequent acts of most revolting cruelty to his own partisans showed a type of that craft, treachery, and utter inhumanity which were hereafter to attaint the bad Italian Popes. He might seem almost to confirm the charge of madness. On the other hand, the highest praise of Clement was that he was a sagacious and experienced politician, a valiant Captain of a Free Company.

The French Cardinals, the King of France, all parties at times spoke loudly of an Œcumenic Council. But who was to summon that Council? how was it to be composed? under whose auspices was it to sit, so that Christendom might have faith in the wisdom or justice of its determinations? As long as the sole question was the validity of Urban's election, the Cardinals declared for a Council; but no sooner had the Antipope been chosen, and the rival claims must be disputed before this uncertain yet authoritative tribunal, than the Cardinals became averse to the measure, and started all possible difficulties. As Clement's party drew back, the Urbanists took up the cry, and clamorously defied their antagonists to meet them before an ecclesiastical Senate of Christendom. General Council.

The rival Popes had first recourse to their spiritual arms. Urban at the close of the year issued a long Brief,

declaring four especially of the French Cardinals, among them the Archbishop of Arles, who had carried off the Papal crown and jewels, the Count of Fondi, and many other of the Romagnese and Campanian nobles, guilty of heresy, schism, treason, and apostasy. All were excommunicated; the Cardinals deposed; the nobles degraded from their haughty order, their estates confiscated; all who had sworn fealty to them were released from their oaths: the usurping Pope was denominated Antichrist.

Acts of Urban;

Clement VII. was not less authoritative or maledictory in his denunciations. The Roman Pope was called upon to lay down his ill-gotten power. He too was an Antichrist, as opposing the College of Cardinals in their full right of electing a Pontiff unawed by popular clamour or fear of death. From Fondi Clement went to Naples. Nothing could equal the magnificence of his reception. The Queen, her husband Otho of Brunswick, many of the nobles and great ecclesiastics kissed his feet.

of Clement.

But Urban in his first creation of twenty-six Cardinals in one day[a] had included many Neapolitans of the highest families and dignities in the kingdom, and had thus secured himself a strong interest. He had degraded Bernard di Montoro, the Archbishop of Naples, and appointed Bozzato, a man of influence and powerful connections in the city. The people had been somewhat jealously excluded from the splendid spectacle of Pope Clement's reception; they rose in their resentment; they declared that they would not desert a Neapolitan for a foreign Pope.[b] Urban's Archbishop set himself at their head. The Queen with great difficulty subdued the insurrection. Clement was so alarmed for his own safety that he fled rapidly to Fondi; and, not daring to rest there, embarked in all speed for Provence. He landed at Marseilles; and from that time became the Pope of Avignon and France.

Flight of Clement from Naples.

Urban's great difficulty was the disorder and poverty of his finances. The usual wealth which flowed to the Papal Court was interrupted by the confusion of the times.

[a] A Niem, i. xii. [b] Giannone, xxiii. 4.

The Papal estates were wasted by war, occupied by his enemies, or by independent princes. Not only did he seize to his own use the revenues of all vacant benefices, and sell to the citizens of Rome property and rights of the churches and monasteries (from this traffic he got 40,000 florins); not only did he barter away the treasures of the churches, the gold and silver statues, crosses, images of saints, and all the splendid furniture; he had recourse to the extraordinary measure of issuing a commission to two of his new Cardinals to sell, empawn, and alienate the estates, and property of the Church, even without the consent of the Bishops, Beneficed Clergy, or Monasteries.[c] Thus having hardly collected sufficient funds, the Pope hired the services of Alberic Barbiano, Captain of one of the Free Companies, and prepared for open war. The Romans undertook the siege of the Castle of St. Angelo, which still held out for the Cardinals and continued to bombard the city. It was at length taken, but the Romans, instead of surrendering it to the Pope, razed the fortress, so long hostile to their liberties, nearly to the ground. The Romans, if they loved not the Pope, had the most cordial detestation of the French. The Pope's courtiers of ultramontane birth or opinions, all indeed except a few Germans and English, were insulted, robbed, treated with every contumely. "I have seen," writes one present, "Roman matrons, to excite the mob against them, spit in the faces of the courtiers."[d] Before the close of the year, Pope Urban could announce to Christendom the total discomfiture of the Gascon and Breton bands by Alberic Barbiano, the capture of St. Angelo, the flight of the Antipope, the submission of the Queen of Naples.[e]

A.D. 1380. Successes of Urban.

[c] Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1380. Urban appointed Cosmo Gentili, Chancellor of Capua, his Nuncio in England. All other commissions were annulled. He was to collect "omnes et singulos fructus, redditus et proventus beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum dicti regni vacantium, per nos seu Aplicâ auctoritate collatorum et conferendorum in antea, census quoque annuos, et alia omnia et singula res et bona nobis et cameræ prædictæ quâcunque ratione vel causâ debita." He specifies Peter's Pence.—MS. B. M., Aug. 27, 1379. The Archbishop of York is ordered to sequester all goods of adherents of Robert, "that son of iniquity." March 14, 1381. All sums, "ratione communium servitiorum" (the ordinary phrase) on the translation of William (Courtenay), Bishop of London, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, to be sent to Rome. Nov. 3, 1382.

[d] Curiales, Theodoric à Niem, i. 14.

[e] Apud Raynald. 1379, n. xxxi.

Pope Urban and Queen Joanna were equally insincere: the Queen in her submission, the Pope in his acceptance of it. Joanna had been the childless wife of four husbands; the heir to the realm of Naples by both lines was Charles of Durazzo, nephew of the King of Hungary. The King of Hungary still cherished the deep purpose of revenge for the murder of his brother. Charles of Durazzo had been already invited during the hostilities of the Pope with Joanna not to wait the tardy succession, but to seize at once the crown of Naples.

Naples.

All the passions least becoming a pontiff combined to influence Urban VI., policy, vengeance, family ambition, interest, pride; policy, for he could not depend on the hollow friendship of Joanna; vengeance, for without Joanna's aid and instigation the Cardinals at Fondi had not dared to elect the Antipope; family ambition, for the nepotism of Urban, like that of his successors, was not content with benefices and cardinalates, it soared to principalities. One of his nephews, Francis Prignano, had been among the new Cardinals; another, Butillo Prignano, he aspired to invest in the princedom of Capua, Amalfi, and other wealthy fiefs. Interest and pride urged the advantage of a King of Naples, indebted to him for his crown, over whose power and treasures he might rule, as he afterwards endeavoured to rule, with the almost undisputed despotism of a Protectorate.[f]

Charles of Durazzo came to Rome; he was invested by the Pope in the Sovereignty of Naples, as forfeited to its liege lord the Pontiff by the iniquities of Queen Joanna: he was crowned by the hand of the Pope.

Charles of Durazzo. June 1, 1381.

Joanna was hardly less undisguised in her hostility to Pope Urban. In evil hour for herself, in worse for Naples, she determined to adopt as her heir Louis of Anjou, nephew of the King of France, thus again inflicting on her unhappy realm all the miseries of a French invasion.

[f] According to Gobelinus Persona, Urban had adherents in Naples. The parties met in strife in the streets: "Vivat Papa di Roma!" "Vivat Papa di Fundis!"—Apud Meibomium, i. p. 297.

The French Pope hastened to invest the French Prince in the rights which, as Pope, he claimed with the same title as his rival in Rome.

Charles of Durazzo was first in the field. The unpopularity of Joanna with her subjects was heightened by their hatred of the French, and the long tradition of their tyranny. The churchmen were for Pope Urban; their inclination had been skilfully increased by the distribution of benefices and dignities. The Hungarian and Papal forces met scarcely any resistance. Treacherous Naples opened its gates. Otho of Brunswick, the husband of Joanna, hastily summoned from Germany, was betrayed by his own bravery into the power of his enemies: Joanna was besieged in the Castel-Nuovo. She looked in vain for the Provençal fleets, and the French armament. Famine compelled her to capitulate; she was sent prisoner to a castle in the Basilicata. The inexorable King of Hungary demanded the death of the murderess, though acquitted of the crime by one Pope, and in close alliance with successive Popes. Pope Urban was silent; the unhappy daughter of a line of kings was put to death, either strangled while at her prayers,[g] or smothered, according to another account, under a pillow of feathers. Thus died Joanna II. of Naples, leaving her fame an historic problem. To some she was a monster of lust and cruelty, the assassin of her husband; to others a wise, even a most religious princess, who governed her kingdom during peace with firm and impartial rule, promulgated excellent laws, established the most equitable tribunals. Her repeated marriages were only from the patriotic desire of bearing an heir to the throne of her fathers.[h]

July 16.

Aug. 25.

22 May, 1382.

Louis of Anjou, in the meantime, had been crowned King of Naples by Clement VII. But Clement, prodigal of all which might embarrass the hostile Pope, not only as liege lord granted away Naples, he created for his French ally a new kingdom, that of Adria.

Louis of Anjou.

[g] A Niem says: "Cum quâdam die oraret, *ut fertur*, sedens ante altare genu flexo, de mandato ipsius Caroli, per quatuor satellites Hungaros fuerat strangulata."

[h] Compare Giannone on the character of Joanna.

It comprised all the Papal territories, the March of Ancona, Romagna, the Duchy of Spoleto, Massa Trabaria, the cities of Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna, Perugia, Todi, the whole region except the City of Rome, with her domain, the Patrimony of St. Peter in Tuscany, the Maritima, and Sabina. These were reserved for the Pope and his successors.[i]

The Provençal fleet of Louis (Provence received him at once as her lord) was too late to rescue the Queen. His powerful land army encountered no resistance till it reached the frontiers of the kingdom.[k] Among the followers of Louis was Robert, Count of Geneva, the brother of Pope Clement. Many of the highest Neapolitan nobles, the great Constable Thomas San Severino, the Tricarici, the Counts of Conversano, Caserta, S. Agata, Altanella, fell off from Charles, and joined the invading ranks. Louis had passed Benevento and occupied Caserta; Charles stood on the defensive.

The embarrassment of Charles was increased by tidings that the Pope was marching towards Naples:[m] he mistrusted his friend almost as much as his enemy. He hastened to meet Urban at Capua, from thence, by Aversa,[n] conducted him to Naples, under the cover of anxiety for his personal safety. He would not permit the Pope to take up his residence in the Archiepiscopal Palace; he escorted him, under a strong guard of honour, to the Castel Nuovo. Charles had eluded the condition of his elevation to the throne, the erection of the principality of Capua for Butillo, the Pope's nephew. Urban seized the opportunity of his distress to demand, not only Capua, with its adjacent towns, Cagnazzo, and Carata, but also the Duchy of Amalfi, Nocera, and other towns and castles. On these

A.D. 1383.

Nov. 1383.

[i] Leibnitz, Cod. fur. Genl. i. 206, quoted by Muratori, Ann., sub ann. 1382.

[k] The army of Louis is stated at 40,000, 45,000, even 60,000 men.—Note of Mansi, in Raynald., A.D. 1382.

[m] Urban set out in May to Tivoli; then to a small castle, Vallemonte, in Campania. He was at Ferentino in Sept. till Michaelmas Day.

[n] At Aversa à Niem (then with Urban) was in a great fright "quod aliquid sinistrum contra nos dispositum esset, quia sicut in sacco tenebamur inclusi." Compare Gobelinus Persona, apud Meibomium. By his account, Charles was compelled to use much courteous force to bring Urban to Naples.

terms, and these alone, the Pope would aid the King against the invading French, and grant the plenary dominion over the rest of the realm. Charles was compelled to yield; the compact was celebrated with great rejoicings; the Pope was permitted to occupy the archiepiscopal palace; the marriage of two of his nieces with two Neapolitan nobles was celebrated with high festivity. In the midst was a tumult in the city. The Pope's nephew had broken into a convent and ravished a nun of high birth and celebrated beauty. Loud complaints were made to the Pope; he laughed it off as a venial outburst of youth: his nephew Butillo was forty years old. But the King's justice would not or dared not endure the crime. A capital sentence was passed against Butillo. The Pope, as Suzerain of the realm, annulled the sentence of the King's Justiciary and of the King. After some contest, Butillo was, if not rewarded, bought off from the indulgence of his lusts, by a wife, the daughter of the Justiciary, and of the King's kindred, with a dowry of 70,000 florins a-year,[o] and the noble castle of Nocera.

Butillo the Pope's nephew.

Spiritual censures were reserved for offenders of another kind. The Pope celebrated high mass, and declared Louis, Count of Anjou, heretic, excommunicated, accursed, published a crusade against him, and offered plenary indulgence to all who should take up arms. Charles of Durazzo was proclaimed Gonfalonier of the Church.[p] During all this time there was a violent persecution of all the Neapolitan clergy, as before of the Sicilian, suspected of inclinations to the Antipope. The Cardinal di Sangro was the chief agent to the Pope in these measures of destitution, confiscation, and torture. The basest of the Clergy were substituted for the ejected Prelates or Abbots.[q]

[o] All this from Theodoric à Niem, then in the Pope's retinue.

[p] MS. B. M. There is a commission appointing John, Duke of Lancaster, Gonfalonier of the Church in the crusade against John, calling himself King of Castile and Leon. March 21, 1383. Privileges are granted to all crusaders against Robert, Antipope, and the King of Castile. About the same time Thomas, Archbishop of York, who owed 2000 florins under the title "communium servitiorum," is called on to pay. Aug. 6, 1383.

[q] "De Sangro credidit sacrificium offerre se Deo, sic omnes ipsos miseros perturbando ... adeo miser et iners Neapolitanorum clericus eâ vice vix reperiebatur, qui non fieret Archepiscopus vel Episcopus aut Abbas vel Prælatus per eundem Urbanum, dummodo talis vellet esse."—Theod. à Niem, i. c. xxvi. Compare, on the persecutions, Vit. I. Clement, p. 502.

Charles protracted the war with skill; it is difficult to account for the inactivity of the French. Charles was suddenly relieved by the death of his enemy. Louis of Anjou died at Bariglio. The French army, already wasted by the plague of which Amadeo, Duke of Savoy, perhaps Louis of Anjou himself, had died,[r] broke up, and retired beyond the Alps.

Death of Louis of Anjou.

Charles had now no open adversary. He had still eluded the surrender of the great city of Capua to the Pope's nephew. He had ceded Nocera, and in that fortress the Pope and some of his Cardinals had taken up their dwelling. The Cardinals had once fled, but were recalled. Amidst the rejoicings of the capital Charles summoned the Pope to meet him to deliberate on important affairs. "Kings have been wont to wait on Popes, not Popes on kings," was the mistrustful and haughty reply of the Pope. He added, to ingratiate himself with the people, "If Charles would have me for his friend, let him repeal the taxes imposed on his kingdom." Charles sent back for answer, "that if he came he would come like a king, at the head of his army; he wondered that priests should presume to interfere with his kingdom—his by force of arms, and as the inheritance of his wife: to the Pope he owed but the four words in the investiture." "The kingdom," rejoined Urban, "belongs to the Church—a fief granted to a king who shall rule with moderation, not flay his subjects to the quick: the Church may resume her gift, and grant it to a more loyal liegeman." Charles made no further answer. Alberic Barbiano, the Constable of the kingdom, with a strong force, laid siege to Nocera. But this old stronghold of the last Mohammedans in the kingdom, defied the insufficient engines and battering trains of the times. Daily might the old Pope be seen on the walls, with lighted torches, and with bells sounding, pronouncing his malediction against the besiegers.[s]

Oct. 10, 1384.

Quarrel of Charles and Pope Urban. May, 1384.

Nov. 1384.

Feb. 1385.

[r] The plague may have been the cause of the previous inactivity. Charles himself had the plague, but recovered.

[s] Urban at least gave ground for the suspicion that he contemplated the resumption of the kingdom, the deposal of Charles. Did his extravagant nepotism look even higher than the princedom of Capua?

Some of the Cardinals, whom Urban had created, and who had followed him, though reluctantly, to Naples (many of them were with him still more reluctantly in Nocera),[t] endeavoured to soften the furious Pope, and to induce him not to provoke too far the victorious Hungarian, now elated with success. They urged him at least to return to Rome. Urban suspected treachery. No doubt some secret consultations were held about his conduct. Bartolino of Piacenza, a bold, shrewd, unscrupulous lawyer, had framed answers to twelve questions, abstract in their form, but significant enough in their intent.[u] "Whether, if the Pope were notoriously negligent or incompetent, or so headstrong and obstinate as to endanger the whole Church—if he should act entirely according to his arbitrary will in contempt of the Council of the Cardinals—it might be lawful for the Cardinals to appoint one or more guardians, according to whose advice he would be bound to regulate his actions." One of the Cardinals, an Orsini by birth, betrayed the secret to the Pope, and declared certain of his brethren privy to the agitation of these perilous questions. The Pope inveigled such as were not there, to Nocera, as though to hold a consistory. Six of them, the most learned and of best repute, were seized and cast into a close and fœtid dungeon, an old tank or cistern. Of the names given are the Cardinal di Sangro, John, Archbishop of Corfu (C. S. Sabina), Ludovico Donati, Archbishop of Tarento (S. Marco), Adam, Bishop of London (C. S. Cecilia), Eleazar, Bishop of Reate.[x] There Theodoric à Niem (whose relation is extant), appointed with other of the Pope's ministers to take their examination, found them in the most pitiable state. The Cardinal di Sangro, a tall and corpulent man, had not room to stretch out his feet. They were loaded with chains. The Pope's ministers questioned them, adjured them in vain to confession. The inquisitors returned to the Pope; two of them burst into tears. Urban sternly taunted their

Arrest of Cardinals.

[t] In Ferentino he had threatened to deprive some.—A Niem, xxviii.

[u] Theodoric à Niem had seen the questions, with the opinions of some learned theologians.

[x] Compare Baluzius, ii. 985.

womanish weakness. Theodoric, by his own account, ventured to urge the Pope to mercy.[y] Urban became only more furious; his face reddened like a lamp; his voice was choked with passion. He produced a confession, wrung forth the day before by torture from the Bishop of Aquila, which inculpated the Cardinals. The conspiracy, indeed, with which they were charged by the suspicion of Urban, or by their enemies who had gained the ear of Urban, was terrible enough. They had determined to seize the Pope, to declare him a heretic, and to burn him.[z] They were brought before the public consistory; if they had confessed, it was believed that they would have been made over to the executioner and the stake. They persisted in their denial; they were thrust back into their noisome dungeon, to suffer from hunger, thirst, cold, and reptiles.

Three days after the Cardinals were submitted to the torture: that of two is described with horrible minuteness by the unwilling witness. The Cardinal di Sangro was stripped almost naked, and hoisted by the pulley. Butillo, the Pope's nephew, stood laughing at his agonies. Thrice he was hoisted. Theodoric, unable to endure the sight, entreated him to make some confession. The Cardinal bitterly reproached himself with the tortures which he himself had inflicted on archbishops, bishops, and abbots, the partisans of the Antipope, for the cause of Urban. The executioner was a fierce ruffian, who had been a pirate, and was now Prior of the Hospitallers. The Cardinal of Venice, an old, feeble, and infirm man, had not to suffer the same bitter self-reproach as Di Sangro: yet he was racked with even worse cruelty from morning to dinner-time. He only uttered, "Christ has suffered for us."

[y] Theodoric à Niem.

[z] "Tanquam hæreticus condemnaretur puniendus... et statim sententiâ per ipsos Cardinales tanquam per Collegium sic latâ, executio ejusdem per ignem fieret ibidem."—A Niem. Gobelinus (of Beneventto), a contemporary, apud Meibomium, i. 301, says: "Prout postea quibusdam officialibus Papæ revelatum est unde ad me notitia hujus facti devenit, quia de familiâ Cameræ Apostolicæ tunc extiti." This version of the affair is even worse for the character of Urban. His harshness and pride had driven above half the Cardinals to invite an Antipope; now the same harshness and pride, with nepotism, had driven five more Cardinals to conspire to seize the Pope and burn him as a heretic. Gobelinus confirms the torture: he speaks of the nephew as Prince of Capua, who seized the Cardinals.

The Pope was heard below in the garden, reciting aloud his breviary, that the executioner might be encouraged by his presence.[a]

Urban was besieged in Nocera; among his fiercest enemies was the Abbot of Monte Casino;[b] but he had still active partisans in Italy. The Pope was the head of a great interest. Raimondello Orsini made a bold diversion in his favour. A Genoese fleet hovered on the coast. Pope Urban made a sudden sally from Nocera, aided by some troops raised by Sanseverino and the Orsini, reached first friendly Benevento, then got on board the galleys between Barletta and Trani. He dragged with him the wretched Cardinals. During the flight to the galleys, the Bishop of Aquila, enfeebled by torture, could not keep his sorry horse to his speed. Urban, suspecting that he sought to escape, in his fury ordered him to be killed; his body was left unburied on the road. With the rest he started across to Sicily; thence to Genoa. The Cardinals, if they reached Genoa alive, survived not long. By some accounts they were tied in sacks and cast into the sea, or secretly despatched in their prisons.[c] One only, the Englishman, was spared: it was said, out of respect for, or at the intervention of, King Richard II. Nocera fell; the Pope's nephew, Butillo, was the prisoner of King Charles.

Escape of the Pope to Genoa.

A.D. 1386.

Urban remained in Genoa almost alone. Some of his

[a] "Idemque Urbanus interim in horto inferius ambulabat, altè legendo officium, ita quod eum legentem nos in aulâ audiebamus, volens dictum Basilium per hoc reddere sollicitum quod mandatum de diligenter torquendo Cardinalem non negligeret."—A Niem, c. lii. p. 44.

[b] They were horrible times. Peter Tartarus, the Abbot of Monte Casino, watched all the outlets from Nocera, seized and put to the torture the partisans of the Pope. "Eos idem Abbas variis tormentis affecit."—Gobelinus, p. 303. A messenger with secret letters to the Pope was taken and slung like a stone from the machines into the castle; he was dashed to pieces. Gobelinus describes the siege at length. He was then at Benevento: he saw a placard offering indulgences to all who would succour the Pope, the same as for a crusade to the Holy Land. See also the flight in Gobelinus, who was in the Pope's train.

[c] Muratori, sub ann. 1385. A Niem says, "Utique ipsi quinque Cardinales postea non videbantur." There was a report that their bodies were thrown into a pit in a stable and consumed with quicklime. Gobelinus (who wrote a poem in praise of Urban) says, "Quinque Cardinales quos usque tunc in carceribus detinuit ibidem mortuos reliquit, sed quomodo aut quali modo vitam finierint, non planè mihi constat." Eleven years after he heard that they had been murdered in prison, and buried in a stable. —P. 310.

Cardinals had perished under his hand; others, Pileus Cardinal of Ravenna, Galeotto of Pietra Mala, fled, after a vain effort to save the lives of their colleagues. They might indeed dread the wrath of the Pontiff: they too had written letters to the Roman clergy, on the means of coercing the proud and cruel Pope, whom they not obscurely declared to be mad, though his madness excused not his horrible wickedness.[d] But Genoa would not endure the barbarous inhumanities of the Pope; not only did the inhabitants treat him with cold disrespect, the magistrates seized and punished some of the satellites of his cruelties: the indignant Pope left the city and proceeded to Lucca.[e] Before this he had shown some disposition to forgive, not indeed, his own enemies. Gian Galeazzo Visconti had surprised his uncle Bernabo by the basest treachery, and poisoned him. Gian Galeazzo had no difficulty (his power and wealth were boundless) in obtaining absolution.[f]

Dec. 1386. The wounded pride of Urban was not the sole motive for his journey to Lucca. Charles, King of Naples, now his deadly foe, had gone to Hungary to claim the crown of that realm. There he had been murdered. His enemies refused him burial, as under excommunication.[g] The Pope remorseless as ever warred against the unburied body, against his widow and his orphans. Queen Margaret and her blameless children were loaded with malediction. Margaret claimed the crown of Naples for her son Ladislaus; the Angevin party for the son of Louis of Anjou. The Pope maintained a haughty and mysterious silence as to their conflicting pretensions.[h] He levied troops; he set himself at their

Feb. 7, 1386. Death of Charles of Durazzo.

Crown of Naples. 1387.

[d] "Literæ apud Baluzium, ii. No. 226. "Ut videbatur insano similis et furenti. .... Multasque iniquitates et detestabilia scelera commisit et cotidie committit." They allege the imprisonment, torture, starvation of the Cardinals at Nocera.

[e] Walsingham asserts that Urban did not get away from Genoa "donec inestimabilem auri summam pro suâ ereptione persolvisset januensibus, qui plus propter nummum quam propter Deum ejus ereptioni prætenderant, sicut patet."—P. 320.

[f] A Niem, c. lvi.

[g] Mailath, Geschichte des Magyaren, ii. 110.

[h] "Dimorava intanto Papa Urbino in Lucca, mirando con dispetto le revoluzioni di Napoli, tutte contrarie a suoi interessi."—Muratori, Ann. sub ann.

head in Perugia. No one could penetrate his design. It was surmised that he aspired to assume the kingdom himself as Pope, or to raise his nephew to the throne. He issued a furious manifesto to the whole of Christendom, calling on all clerks and laymen to take up arms and join the Papal forces against the Antichrist the Pope of Avignon, alleging the example of the Levites who slew in one day 23,000 idolaters without regard to kindred or consanguinity, and against the contumacious kingdom of Naples.[l] Of the rights of Ladislaus not one word, though Queen Margaret had attempted to propitiate him, by sending his nephew, a prisoner since the capture of Nocera by King Charles, to Genoa.

This nephew, Butillo, was at once the madness, the constant disgrace, danger, and distress of the weak, imperious, unforgiving Pontiff. At Perugia the ruffian stole into the house of a noble lady, for whom he had a violent passion; he was waylaid by her brothers, and well scourged. The Pope withdrew from the insolent city, but he did not suspend his martial preparations. He had determined to provide for his financial wants, and to confirm his waning popularity with the burghers of Rome, by a Jubilee, of which he himself might reap the immediate fruits. The period of this great festival had been contracted by Clement VI. to fifty years. An ingenious calculation discovered, that if the time of the Saviour's life were reckoned, thirty-three years, the Jubilee would fall during the year next ensuing.[k] This holy pretext was eagerly seized; Christendom was summoned to avail itself of the incalculable blessings of a pilgrimage to Rome, with all the benefits of indulgences. The treasury of the Holy See was prepared to receive the tribute of the world.

But Urban sowed for another to reap.[m] A fall from his mule shook the enfeebled frame of the Pontiff. He could not return to Perugia, distant about ten Aug. 1388.

[l] This manifesto is dated Lucca, Aug. 29, 1387. It contains this extraordinary passage about the Virgin Mary (the army was to assemble on the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin): "Quæ est impiis terribilis, velut castrorum acies ordinata, et cunctas hæreses *sola* interemit in toto mundo."—Apud Raynald. 1387, No. 6.

[k] Gobelinus, p. 310.

[m] The words of Theodoric à Niem.

miles: he was carried in a litter to Ferentino, on his way to the kingdom of Naples. At the approach of winter he was compelled, by the failure of funds for the payment of his soldiers, to return to Rome. He was coldly received.[n]

Death of Urban VI. Oct. 15, 1389.

He lingered for a year, giving directions to regulate and eagerly awaiting the coming Jubilee, which he never saw. He died in the autumn.

Charity might almost admit for the manners and the acts of this Pontiff the excuse of insanity (some of the Cardinals manifestly entertained this belief); but whether more than the insanity of ungoverned passions, pride, ambition, cruelty, and blind nepotism, must be left to wiser judgement than that of man.[o]

Clement VII.

Clement VII. reigned at Avignon in comparative peace and dignity. The fiercer parts of his character, which had been so darkly shown during his wars as Legate, at the massacre of Cesena, in which perished 30,000 human beings, were no longer called into action. His war against his adversary was waged by the more innocuous arms of encountering ecclesiastical censures, and by the investiture of Louis of Anjou in the kingdom of Naples. The clergy in all the great kingdoms followed or led their rulers. No doubt there were partisans of Clement in the realms which espoused the cause of Urban—of Urban in those which sided with Clement. Schism, when it was a stern acknowledged duty to hate, punish, exterminate schismatics, could not but produce persecution and victims of persecution. Everywhere might be found divisions, spoliations, even bloodshed; ejected and usurping clergy, dispossessed and intrusive abbots and bishops; feuds, battles for churches and monasteries. Among all other causes of discord, arose this the most discordant; to the demoralizing and unchristianising tendencies of the times was added a question on which the best might differ, which to the bad would be an excuse for

[n] Gobelinus adorns his return to Rome with miracles, and says, "Romam cum honore magno regressus est."

[o] "Hic obiit Romæ et dicitur quod fuerit intoxicatus propter nimiam suam duritiam."—Chron. Ratisbon. Eccard, i. 2118. Walsingham sums up the character of Urban VI.: "Rigidus erat sibi, sed suis multò rigidior, ita ut delinquentibus nunquam ignosceret, aut eorum ærumnis aliquatenus compateretur: probat hæc pœna suorum Cardinalium ferociter inflicta et æterna damnatio carceris subsecuta."—P. 346.

every act of violence, fraud, or rapacity. Clement and his Cardinals are charged with great atrocities against the adherents of Urban.[p] The Italian partisans of Clement, who escaped the cruelty of Urban, crowded to the court of Clement; but that court, at first extremely poor, gave but cold entertainment to these faithful strangers: they had to suffer the martyrdom of want for their loyalty. When this became known, others suppressed their opinions, showed outward obedience to the dominant power, and so preserved their benefices.[q] France at times bitterly lamented her indulgence of her pride and extravagance, in adhering to her separate Pontiff. If France would have her own Pope, she must be at the expense of maintaining that Pope and his Conclave. While the Transalpine kingdoms in the obedience of Urban rendered but barren allegiance, paid no tenths to the Papal See, took quiet possession of the appointment to vacant benefices; in France the liberties of the Church were perpetually invaded. The clergy were crushed with demands of tenths or subsidies; their estates were loaded with debts to enrich the Apostolic Chamber. The six-and-thirty Cardinals had proctors in ambush in all parts of the realm, armed with Papal Bulls, to give notice if any large benefice fell vacant in cathedral or collegiate churches, or the priories of wealthy abbeys. They were immediately grasped as Papal reserves, to reward or to secure the fidelilty of the hungry Cardinals.[r] They handed these down in succession to each other, sometimes condescending to disguise the accumulation of pluralities by only charging the benefices with large payments to themselves. "So," says an ecclesiastic of the day, "the generous intentions of kings and royal families were frustrated, the service of God was neglected, the devotion of the faithful grew cold, the realm was drained; many ecclesiastics were in the

[p] "Multum enim atrociter contra obedientes dicto Urbano præfatus Clemens et sui Cardinales ac eorum complices, in principio dicti schismatis, se habuerunt."—See the rest of the passage, Theodoric à Niem, i. xix.

[q] Vit. Clement. p. 497. Evils of the Schism, ibid. Compare with à Niem.

[r] Compare the Monk of S. Denys: "Omnes ecclesiasticas dignitates quascunque, post episcopalem, majores indifferenter suæ dispositioni reservavit."—P. 82. See also p. 398, and the regulations adopted by the King, at the instance of the University of Paris, to check the Papal exactions.

lowest state of penury; the flourishing schools of the realm were reduced to nothing; the University of Paris mourned for want of scholars."[s] Clement had the satisfaction of receiving some important partisans, who were alienated by the rude manners or repulsive acts of Urban. The two surviving Italian Cardinals of the old Conclave, Milan and Florence, joined him early. The Cardinal of Prato and the Cardinal of Pietra Mala[t] had revolted from Urban at Genoa. Di Prato publicly burned his red hat, and received another from Clement. But on the accession of Boniface IX. he fell back again to the Italian Pontiff: he was called in derision the triple-hatted.[u] The kingdoms of Spain, after an ostentatiously laborious examination of the titles of the two Pontiffs, were won, by the dexterous diplomacy of the Cardinal of Lucca, to Clement. Clement was generous, affable, accomplished, perhaps with more of the French noble than the Pope. He was splendid and liberal, and therefore could not be too scrupulous as to the sources of his revenue. The creation of Cardinals was chiefly in the French interest, as those of his predecessors, to perpetuate the see at Avignon, though he did not lose sight of the advantage of maintaining some Italian supporters. His nepotism tempted him not to the daring courses of Urban; his kindred were content with ecclesiastical dignities or Church estates, which Clement did not hesitate to alienate to the lay nobility. By the death of his brother, Clement became Count of Geneva, but in him expired the line. He survived his rival Urban VI. about five years.[x]

[s] Relig. S. Denys, ut supra. Documents Inédits.

[t] Ciacconius, p. 637.

[u] The indignant biographer of Clement charitably wishes him a fourth of red-hot brass or steel.—Apud Baluz. p. 524.

[x] He died Sept. 16, 1394. See on his death next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

BONIFACE IX. BENEDICT XIII.

THE Avignonese Pontiff, Clement VII., and his Cardinals had some vague hope that on the death of Urban Christendom would recognise his claims. These hopes were speedily dissipated. The Italian Cardinals proceeded at once to the election of Peter Tomacelli, a Neapolitan.[a] He took the name of Boniface IX. Would he be the worthy successor of the last true Italian Pope, Boniface VIII.? He was a man of ability;[b] though by one account not above thirty years old, he had mastered the passions of youth. After the turbulent and restless reign of Urban, that of Boniface might seem to promise at least comparative repose. The charge against his fame is insatiable avarice, flagrant and shameless simony. But Boniface was pressed with more than common necessities.[c] The schism imposed upon Christendom the maintenance of two Papal Courts; the more peaceful magnificence of Avignon; that of Rome less secure, involved in almost inevitable wars, and in the perplexed politics of Italy. The ordinary revenues of the Roman Pontiff were cut off. France, once the wealthiest and most prodigal of the kingdoms, and Spain, acknowledged the Antipope. In England the King and the Parliament had become extremely jealous of the wealth of their own Clergy, still more of the subsidies levied by Rome. The statutes of the realm began to speak a defiant and economic language; that of Provisors under Edward III.,

Boniface IX.

State of Italy.

[a] On this election the Monk of St. Denys observes: "Infidelibus quoque sancta religio et Catholica fides habebatur ludibrio, dum Bonifacius Romæ, Clemens vero Avinione sibi Apostolicam auctoritatem vindicabant."—xi. 9, p. 692.

[b] He was not skilled in chanting or in writing, not eminently instructed in any science but grammar, fluent in speech. Theodoric à Niem, one of his secretaries, had a contemptuous opinion of his capacity for business.

[c] "Per lo Papa manteneva lo stato suo con molta pace, e dovizia."—Infessura, apud Muratori, p. 1175.

the fuller statute of Mortmain under Richard II., showed a determination to set a limit to the boundless exactions of the hierarchy. The Clergy were not unwilling to restrict the tribute paid to the Papal Chamber. The progress of Wycliffite opinions strengthened the reluctance of the people. The Pope was reduced to implore a charitable subsidy of the Archbishop and Clergy;[d] and could not but betray how he writhed under the stern restrictions of the statutes of Provisors, and the refusal to permit the revenues of English benefices to enrich the Cardinals of Rome.[e] The northern kingdoms, as well as Poland and Hungary, were poor. Germany had to maintain her own splendid and princely Prelates, and those Prelates to keep up their own state. In Italy the Patrimony of St. Peter had been invaded by the Duke of Milan, Gian Galeazzo Visconti, who seemed to aspire to the kingdom of Italy. On his death the Duke bequeathed to his sons, among his territories, Bologna, Perugia, Sienna. Even in the immediate domain of the See most of the towns and cities were in the power of petty independent tyrants or of the old nobles. Naples was distracted by civil war. The sons of Charles of Durazzo and Louis of Anjou were fighting for the throne.

At the same time there were imperious demands on the Papal exchequer. The Pope could not stand aloof from the affairs of Naples. The nepotism of Boniface was more humble than the audacious family ambition of Urban. He espoused at once the cause of Ladislaus. Queen Margaret was relieved from ecclesiastical censures, and the house of Hungary declared the rightful heirs. But the award of the Holy See must be enforced; aid in money and in troops

[d] MS. B. M. He writes to the Archbishop of Canterbury to obtain "certum caritativum subsidium," Jan. 2, 1390.

[e] See the very curious document, MS. B. M., in which Boniface rehearses at length all the main articles of the three Statutes of Provisors passed by Edward III. and Richard: his utter amazement that it came from such a Catholic King, one so zealous for the orthodox faith (with almost a page of laudatory titles): "The King ought to have seen, what is clearer than noonday, that laymen can have no right to dispose of ecclesiastical things." He pronounces all the statutes "cassa et irrita." Feb. 4, 1391. He writes of the great Council of the realm, "Quia nonnulli avaro cupiditatis vicio." Certain persons had intruded into benefices held in York by Adam, Cardinal of S. Cecilia. He urges redress to the Cardinal. March 15, 1391. A month after he makes a pathetic appeal to the whole clergy of England for a subvention. They coldly refused it. April 14, 1391. We have one account of his modest receipts, amounting to but 1515 florins, reckoned equal to 252*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

must be afforded to expel the French usurper, whose title was his grant from the Pope of Avignon. In Rome, where at first Boniface took up his abode, all was ruin. The churches were in miserable dilapidation; the Capitol was falling; the Castle of St. Angelo had been almost razed to the ground. The Jubilee of 1390, to which pilgrims came from Germany, England, Poland, Hungary, enriched the Papal coffers for a time. Boniface raised 600 horse under Alberic Barbiano, in aid of Naples. He ordered extensive repairs in the churches. The treasures in hand were soon exhausted. The one resource of the Papal Chamber was the wealth of the Clergy, and that wealth could hardly be reached by direct taxation. The Pope was reduced to that which was branded by the odious name of Simony, and, as the system was organised by Boniface IX., was Simony in its worst form. At first, and even for seven years of his Pontificate, Boniface stood in some awe of the more rigid Cardinals. Simony. He did not publicly take money for the higher promotions; he took it only in secret, and through trustworthy agents: but he had always reasons to allege to the Cardinals against the advancement of those who were unable or refused to pay. As these Cardinals to his joy dropped off, he gave free rein to his cupidity.[f] At length, after ten years, at once to indulge, palliate, and to establish this simony, he substituted as a permanent tax the Annates, or First-fruits of every bishopric and rich abbey, calculated on a new scale, triple that in which they stood before in the Papal books.[g] This was to be paid in advance by Annates. the candidates for promotion, some of whom never got possession of the benefice. That was matter of supreme indifference to Boniface, as he could sell it again. But as these candidates rarely came to the court with money equal to the demand, usurers, with whom the Pope was in unholy league, advanced the sum on exorbitant interest. The debt was sometimes sued for in the Pope's court.

[f] By a regulation in his Chancery of the seventh year of his Papacy, the Archbishop, Bishop, or Abbot who did not exhibit letters from the Pope himself in the Papal Exchequer, and had not fully discharged all the claims upon him, forfeited his preferment.

[g] Mansi has proved against Raynaldus, that Boniface, if not the inventor of the annates, first made them a perpetual burthen.—Note on Raynald. sub ann.

The smaller benefices were sold from the day of his appointment with shameless and scandalous notoriety. Men wandered about Lombardy and other parts of Italy, searching out the age of hoary incumbents, and watching their diseases and infirmities. For this service they were well paid by the greedy aspirants at Rome. On their report the tariff rose or fell. Benefices were sold over and over again. Graces were granted to the last purchaser, with the magic word "Preference,"[h] which cost twenty-five florins. That was superseded by a more authoritative phrase (at fifty florins), a prerogative of precedence.[i] Petitions already granted were sometimes cancelled in favour of a higher bidder; the Pope treated the lower offer as an attempt to defraud him. In the same year the secretary Theodoric à Niem had known the same benefice sold in the course of one week to several successive claimants. The benefices were so openly sold that if money was not at hand the Pope would receive the price in kind, in swine, sheep, oxen, horses, or grain. The officers were as skilful in these arts as himself. His auditors would hold twenty expectatives, and receive the first-fruits. The Argus-eyed Pope, however, watched the death-bed of all his officers. Their books, robes, furniture, money, escheated to the Pope. No grace of any kind, even to the poorest, was signed without its florin fee. The Pope, even during Mass, was seen to be consulting with his secretaries on these worldly affairs.[k] The accumulation of pluralities on unworthy men was scandalous even in those times.[m]

Nepotism of Boniface.

The rapacity of Boniface was more odious from the unpopularity of his mother and his brothers; the mother the most avaricious of women, his brothers

[h] Anteferre.

[i] Prærogativa antelationis.

[k] Compare à Niem, ii. c. 7 to 12.

[m] "*Vidi* etiam tunc unius auditorum causarum dicti Bonifacii hominis inutilis et solo nomine Decretorum Doctoris literas super expectativâ gratiâ in diversis provinciis Germaniæ fabricatas, in quibus dispensabatur inter alia secum, quod sex incompatibilia beneficia recipere et simul retinere, illaque totiens, quotiens sibi placeret, simpliciter vel ex causâ pronunciationis dimittere et loco dimissorum totidem similia et dissimilia beneficia recipere et retinere posset etiam si essent dignitates majores post Pontificales," &c. &c.—A Niem, ii. xi. Compare Gobelinus, who is almost as strong on the abuses of the Papal Chancery under Boniface IX. as à Niem, pp. 316, 318.

and their sons, in whose favour the nepotism of Boniface, in general sordid, yet in one instance was ostentatiously prodigal. He bought the principality of Sora for one of them at an enormous price from Ladislaus of Naples.

Boniface, on his accession, had proclaimed to Christendom his earnest anxiety to extinguish the schism. The means he proposed were not well chosen to promote the end. He addressed Clement VII. as the son of Belial. "Some perverse men, trusting in the arm of flesh against the Lord, cry out for a Council. O damned and damnable impiety!"[n] Two years after he sent a milder letter by two Carthusian monks. They were imprisoned by Clement, and only released on the intervention of the King of France.

The death of Clement VII. might seem a providential summons to close the schism. The University of Paris, now the first learned body in Christendom, had already taken the lead, denouncing the diabolical schism.[o] They had urged the King to take the affairs into his own hands, and to compel the conflicting Popes to accede to one of three schemes for the termination of the contest — Cession, Arbitration, or a General Council. Clement had received this memorial in a fury of passion: he denounced it as an insolent and defamatory libel. "Dost thou understand this Latin?" he said to the bearer. "Sufficiently!" the officer replied; but when the Pope withdrew into his chamber in much manifest wrath he thought it prudent to leave Avignon. The Pope would see no one,

Sept. 16, 1394.

[n] "Sed dicunt impii perversores, in carnali brachio contra potentiam Domini confidentes, fiat Concilium, ut schisma sedetur. O damnosa, et damnanda impietas!" He accuses the Cardinals of having gained the consent of the King of France to the creation of Clement, by accusing Urban VI. of a design to deprive him of his kingdom. It was the aim of the King of France to unite the French and Papal crowns.—Apud D'Achery, vol. i. p. 770. The Monk of S. Denys gives this letter, l. xiii. 14. The second, xiv. 12.

[o] See for the proceedings of the University, during the lifetime of Clement, the Monk of St. Denys, xiv. 10. Read too (in the Gersoniana) the address of the University to the King—Quare hoc? They ask of the consequences of the schism. Because unworthy men are promoted to the highest rank in the Church. "Quibus nihil sancti est, nihil pensi nihil honesti curæ sit; exhauriunt ecclesias, religiones dissipant, monasteria spoliant." The churches are in ruins; the lower priesthood oppressed, reduced to mendicancy; the treasures of the churches sold. "Exactiones gravissimas, maximas, intolerabiles pauperibus Ecclesiæ ministris imponunt, impiissimos homines, atque inhumanissimos ad colligendum eligunt," &c. &c.

speak to no one. The Cardinals met and agreed to press on the Pope the measures proposed by the University. He assembled them, and bitterly reproached them with their traitorous cowardice. They replied by urging calmly the necessity of the measure. Clement retired and never more left his chamber. Three days after he was struck with apoplexy: his death was attributed to his grief.[p] So soon as his death was known the University wrote again to the King, adjuring him to prohibit the Cardinals at Avignon from proceeding to a new election.[q] The wary Cardinals, lest they should seem to despise the king's counsel, hurried over the election, and then opened the royal letter. The Cardinals swore to do all in their power to end the Schism now they had put it out of their power. No act could be more certain to perpetuate it than the election of the Spaniard, the crafty, able, ambitious, unprincipled Cardinal of Luna. Before the election their solemn oath had been taken to each other that whoever was chosen should at once resign the Papacy at the requisition of the Cardinals if Boniface would likewise resign. The Cardinal of Luna had been the loudest to condemn the Schism; he had openly and repeatedly declared that if he were Pope he would put an end to it at once.

Sept. 18, 1394.

Oct. 13, 1394.

Benedict XIII. (such was his title) communicated his election to the King of France. "The importunity of the Cardinals had compelled him to accept the unwelcome office, but he was prepared by all means which should be advisable to promote the union of the Church."[r] The University sent an address, eloquent and almost adulatory; it was received with the most gracious urbanity. "I am as ready to resign the office as to take off this cap." He took it off and saluted them. Each of the Popes was fully prepared to heal the Schism provided he himself remained Pope; but neither could show such disrespect to the Cardinals to whom he owed his elevation as to invalidate their privilege of election: neither would acknowledge himself an intrusive and usurping Pontiff.

Benedict XIII. Oct. 23.

[p] Rel. de St. Denys, xv. v.

[q] There are 24 names of Cardinals in Ciacconius.

[r] Dupuy, Hist. du Schisme, p. 39.

In Italy Boniface IX., notwithstanding his rapacity (perhaps through his rapacity, which extorted ecclesiastical wealth for the secular purposes of his government), by ability, moderation, and firmness, had made some progress in the reinstatement of the Papacy in respect and authority.[s] That respect it had almost lost, when the Roman dominions of the Pope were treated as the province of a foreign prelate, oppressed rather than governed by a Cardinal Legate: that authority the fierce and desultory ambition of Urban VI. had shaken rather than confirmed. The noble city of Perugia was weary of her factions, Guelf and Ghibelline. The Beccarini (the nobles and their partisans), the Raspanti (the burghers with their adherents) offered to receive the Pope as a resident and as sovereign within their walls. Boniface knew that nothing promoted the popularity of the Pope in Rome so much as his absence. No sooner had the Romans lost the Pope than they were eager for his return. He moved to Perugia. Ancona and some of the other cities made advances towards submission. But the unhappy parsimony of Boniface did not permit him to environ himself with a strong well-paid body of guards, which might keep down the still adverse factions in Perugia. At midnight, during the following summer, he was awakened by a wild tumult.[t] The exiled Guelfs, who had re-entered the city through his mediation, had risen, not without provocation, and were perpetrating frightful carnage on the Ghibellines. Pandolfo Baglioni, the head of the Ghibelline nobles, his brother, eighty nobles, a hundred of their followers, the Beccarini, were slain. The Pope fled in horror and disgust to Assisi. Biordo, a chief of Condottieri, in league with the Guelf Raspanti, was under the walls with 1500 adventurers. He entered the city and became its lord. Biordo's power lasted not long; he was excommunicated by the Pope. The Pope with bolder nepotism had now created his brother Marquis of the March of Ancona. The Marquis

Boniface IX.

In Perugia. Oct. 17, 1392.

July 30, 1393.

May 22, 1394.

[s] "Nec fuit ante eum quisquam Romanorum pontificum, qui talem potestatem temporalem Romæ et in patrimonio S. Petri exercuisse legatur."—Gobelinus, p. 316.

[t] Theodoric à Niem, ii. xv. He was with the Pope. See also Sismondi, Républiques Italiennes, t. vii. p. 350.

was besieged in Macerata by Biordo, taken prisoner, and released for a large ransom. Biordo even became master of Assisi by treachery, but himself, having made peace with the Pope,[u] was murdered in Perugia by the Abbot of St. Peter's, who aspired by this good deed to the Cardinalate. "Perugia will not endure a tyrant," was the watchword of the new insurrection. The Abbot was received by Boniface, but died a short time after unrewarded. The Pope had long before the fall of Biordo determined no more to honour the fickle and perilous city of Perugia with his residence. He had returned by urgent invitation to Rome; he made the Capitol a strong fortress. But Rome would neither be without the Pope, nor when he was within her walls leave him in peace. They took umbrage at the fortification of the Capitol; the life of Boniface was endangered in an insurrection, instigated by the Bannerets of the city. He was saved by the fortunate presence of King Ladislaus with some troops. Not two years after broke out another revolt. The Pope met it with firmness. Thirteen persons were executed.[x]

A.D. 1396. Assassination. A.D. 1398. Rome. A.D. 1399.

But the Pope had other means to reduce the contumacious city. The year of Jubilee was at hand. He treated that which had been interpolated by his predecessor but ten years before, and of which himself had enjoyed the gains, as an irregular breach on the solemn order of the Ritual. To Rome the Jubilee was of as inestimable value as to the Pope. Without the Pope it was a vain unprofitable ceremony. They sent an embassy to entreat him to vouchsafe his presence. Boniface yielded, but enforced his own conditions. His partisan, the Malatesta, was to be created Senator of Rome. The magistracy of the Bannerets, the democratic leaders of the Regions of the city, was to be abrogated for ever. Boniface entered, and assumed for the first time the full sovereignty of Rome.[y] He had

[u] According to Theodoric à Niem the Pope was concerned in the murder of Biordo, returned to Perugia, and fled again to Assisi. I am not quite confident that I have rightly unravelled this intricate affair, which lasted several years.

[x] "Egli, che neu era figliuolo della paura fece prendere i delinquenti," &c. —Muratori, sub ann. 1397.

[y] Sozomen. Hist. S. R. I. xvi. Raynaldus, sub ann. 1400.

already, it has been seen, fortified the Capitol; the Castle of St. Angelo rose again from its ruins in more than its ancient strength. But this was not without a fierce struggle. Two of the Colonnas, lords of Palestrina, in league with the deposed Bannerets, broke into the city, and reached the foot of the Capitol with shouts, "Death to the Pope; long live the Roman people." They were repulsed; thirty-one hung up alive.[z] Jan. 1400.

The Jubilee was held in all its pomp and all its prodigality of pardon. Pilgrims from all Christendom flocked to Rome, even from France, notwithstanding the inhibition of the King. To the French the Pope who bestowed indulgences was the legitimate Pope. The King himself, by besieging the Antipope Benedict XIII. in Avignon, and by taking him into captivity, had destroyed the awe which belonged to the holy office. Many of the wealthier pilgrims, however, brought not their rich offerings to the shrines of the Apostles in Rome. They were plundered in every part of the neighbourhood, noble matrons and damsels ravished. The plague broke out in the crowded city. The Pope thought of withdrawing to a place of security, but he dared not risk the loss of Rome, the loss of the oblations. His bitter adversary taunts him with refusing alms to the plundered and dying pilgrims.[a]

But a more formidable enemy to the Popedom seemed to be advancing with irresistible force. The first time for centuries, Italy seemed likely to fall under the dominion of a native King. Gian Galeazzo Visconti had cast off the ignoble name of Count of Virtù;[b] by the sanction of the Emperor Wenceslaus he was Duke of Milan. By his success in arms, by his more successful intrigues, he had obtained the power, he meditated the assumption of the title, of "King of Italy." All the great cities of Lombardy owned his dominion; Bologna, Perugia, Sienna were his. He threatened at once Florence and Rome. All the great Free Companies, all the distinguished generals, marched under the standard of the Gian Galeazzo of Milan.

[z] Theodoric à Niem, ii. c. xxvii. A youth was compelled by promise of pardon to hang the rest; among them were his own father and brother.

[a] "Solitus enim erat rapere, nec rapta indigentibus communicare."—A Niem, ii. 28.

[b] Muratori, Ann., sub ann. 1395.

Serpent. What had a Pope, with a contested title, a Pope even with the ability of Boniface, to oppose to such puissance? and, against a King of Italy with such vast territories, wealth, ambition, what had been the Pope?

The death of Gian Galeazzo from the plague relieved the Republic of Florence and the Pope. His last will[c] divided his great dominions among his sons. All the great warlike Lombard Republics, the cities of Tuscany and Romagna, were recited in that will as passing to his descendants. The Pope, with prompt ability, took advantage of the occasion. He detached the famous Alberic Barbiano, the Great Constable, from the service of Milan. Barbiano with his bands began the reconquest of the cities in the ecclesiastical territories. His avarice and extortions gave Boniface the command of wealth, wealth the command of all the mercenary soldiery in Italy, and all the soldiery were mercenary.[d] Had not Boniface been compelled by the failure of his health and a painful disease to retire to the warm baths of Pozzuoli, he might have witnessed the restoration of the whole patrimony of St. Peter to his rule.

Sept. 3, 1402.

During all this period the Ultramontane Kings had been labouring to extinguish the Schism. So long as the Pope at Avignon was a Frenchman, so long the King of France and the French Cardinals adhered to his cause. Their sympathy with a Spaniard was much less strong,[e] the evils of the Schism became more glaringly manifest. Immediately after the accession of Benedict XIII. the King (Charles VI.) summoned a Council of the higher Clergy of Paris. Simon de Cramault, Patriarch of Alexandria, Bishop of Carcassonne, presided in the Council over nine Arch-Bishops, forty-six Bishops, Abbots and Doctors innumer-

Benedict XIII.

A.D. 1395.

[c] See the will and the magnificent obsequies in Corio, Storia di Milano, l. iv. p. 286.

[d] "Verbis conflatis in aurum, auroque verso in arma, terras ecclesiæ alienatas rebellibus subactis, verbis, auro, armis potenter recuperavit." — Gobelinus, p. 323.

[e] "Ferunt quidem Dominos Cardinalis Gallicos odio habentes Dominum Benedictum pro eo quod erat alterius nationis quam Gallicæ, et quoniam inter se de uno Gallico post mortem Clementis VII. non potuerunt concordare, propterea in istum convenerunt." — Contin. Chronic. Theodor. à Niem, apud Eccard. i. p. 1534.

able. The Council threw aside at once the proposition of compelling all the Christian kingdoms who supported the Italian Pontiff to submit to Benedict XIII.[f] It was an avowed impossibility. Three courses remained:—1. A General Council; 2. Compromise by the appointment of arbiters; but who was to choose the arbiters, or enforce their award? 3. The renunciation of both into the hands of the College of Cardinals — either the two Colleges united in one, or each to his own College. The voices were in overwhelming number for the renunciation. A stately embassy was determined of three Princes of the blood, the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy the King's sons, the Duke of Orleans his brother, three Bishops, Senlis, Poitiers, and Arras, with eight nobles. The University of Paris addressed letters to all the Cathedral chapters of France, urging them to make processions, and offer prayers for the success of this embassy. The Ambassadors arrived at Avignon. The Pope first entrenched himself behind forms; but he was at length obliged to admit them to an audience.[g] Gilles de Champs communicated to the Pope that the King and the Church having duly considered all other courses had determined on that of the renunciation of the two Popes. Benedict sought delay; he was Vicar of Christ, answerable to Christ in an affair of this solemn import; it must not be driven on with unseemly speed. The Ambassadors returned; they summoned the Cardinals in the King's name to Villeneuve (on the right bank of the Rhone). Of the twenty Cardinals nineteen approved the project of the King; the Spanish Cardinal of Pampeluna alone declared that it was injustice to place the legitimate Pope on a level with the intruder Boniface. Benedict attempted to propitiate the Ambassadors by courtesy and hospitality. They dined with him, he gave them the blandest promises. At length he delivered a schedule with a counter-project. The two Popes and the two Colleges of Cardinals were to meet in some place bordering on France, under the King's protection. No one could discern more clearly than Bene-

Ambassadors to Avignon.

June 1, 1395.

Benedict's counter-project.

[f] This was called the "via facti."

[g] Dupuy, Hist. du Schisme, p. 43.

dict himself the insuperable difficulties of this scheme: it was rejected by the ambassadors of the King, by those of the University, and by the Cardinals. Their prayers, remonstrances, admonitions were vain. Benedict took a lofty tone; he commanded them under the penalties of contumacy, disobedience, unbelief, under threats of the severest procedures, to adopt his scheme and no other. Some fell on their knees, and conjured him with tears to assent to the counsels of the high and mighty Prince. Benedict replied, "They were his subjects; he was their sovereign; he was lord not only over them, but over all who were living in death;[h] he had to render account to God alone!" The negotiations lingered on, but at length the Ambassadors returned to Paris. It was determined to enter into communication with the other great powers of Christendom. Two Abbots were sent into Germany; the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Admiral of France, and other nobles into England. Benedict attempted to win the King of France by the grant of a tenth. This alienated the Clergy; the King dared not levy the subsidy. The University of Paris entered an appeal against all acts of Benedict to a future one, true, and universal Pope. Benedict in a Bull annulled this defamatory libel.[i] The next year the University replied to the Bull by a new appeal, in which they declared that many Popes had been repudiated for their wickedness.

A.D. 1395.

A.D. 1396.

Two years passed. In 1398 the Assembly of the States and Clergy of France met again. There were present the Dukes of Berry, Burgundy, Orleans, the King of Navarre, eight Archbishops, thirty-two Bishops, Abbots without number, deputies from five Universities. It was announced not only that the King and the Church of France had determined the renunciation by both Popes, the Kings of Hungary, Bohemia, England,[k] Arragon, Castile, Navarre,

[h] "Mortement vivants."—Dupuy, p. 51.

[i] Gersoniana, p. xii.

[k] In 1398, Benedict seems to have entertained some hope of moving the King of France against the Antipope Boniface. He writes to Richard II. of England to interpose in his behalf with the King of France, whom Richard called Father (Richard had married Isabella of France), but who had long strayed from the bosom of Mother Church and the way of truth.—MS. B. M., Dec. 21, 1398.

and Sicily concurred in this measure as the only way to end the Schism. After long, grave, learned debate, a vast majority had resolved on the unconditional subtraction of allegiance from Benedict XIII. This act of renunciation was solemnly published with processions and prayers on a Sunday, and promulgated by letters with the King's signature throughout the realm.[1] No sooner was it published at Avignon than the Cardinals, except Pampeluna and Tarascon, disclaimed Pope Benedict; he thundered invectives against them; they withdrew across the Rhone to Villeneuve in the dominions of the King. July 21.

Peter d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambray, the most learned theologian of the age, had held the singular office of enforcing on both Popes the duty of renouncing their dignity, and submitting to a just award. At a Council at Rheims, the Bishop of Cambray received his commission from the Emperor and the King of France, and the Clergy of both realms. He had set out for Rome. He found Pope Boniface at Foudi, having subdued the turbulent and marauding Count, the author or abettor of the Schism, and who had boldly alleged his refusal to acknowledge the Roman Pontiff as an excuse for plundering his dominions. The Commissioner of the Ultramontane Sovereigns returned to Rome with the Pontiff. Boniface entertained him with the utmost courtesy, and with vague but promising protestations of his earnest desire to close the Schism. The Pope's avaricious and ambitious brothers took alarm at the extent of his concessions. Throughout Rome were murmurs of doubt and apprehension. They feared lest they should lose their Pope, their dignity, their profit, the general pardon of the Jubilee.[m] A great deputation addressed the Pope, ex- Peter d'Ailly. A.D. 1398. At Rome.

[1] See the Document in the monk of St. Denys, xix. c. 5. He enters at length into the conduct of Pope Benedict. Among other charges is the following: "Successivè idem Benedictus, ad suam ambitionem hujusmodi palliandam, quosdam per diversa mundi climata mandavit falsidicos, qui non erubuerunt contra veritatem seminare, quod iidem illustris ducis legati, solum et adeò apperuerunt viam cessionis simplicis parte nostrâ, ut illico cederet, *et unus Gallicus eligèretur in Papam.*"

[m] "Se doutèrent fort les Romains, qu'ils ne perdissent la siège du Pape qui par an trop leur valoit, et portoit grand profit, et en tous les pardons generaux, qui devoient être dedans deux ans à venir, dont tout profit devoit redonder en la citè de Rome et la environ."—

horting him to assert himself to be the true Pope, not to abandon the privilege and patrimony of St. Peter. They would hazard their lives in defence of his right. "My good children," returned Boniface, "Pope I am, Pope will I remain, despite all treaty of the Kings of France and Germany."

Peter d'Ailly had returned to France; he was now joined in a second Commission to Avignon with the Marshal Boucicaut. If the eloquence of the Bishop should not prevail, the Marshal was to employ the force of arms. Peter d'Ailly arrived in the Court of Benedict. He had first an interview with Pope Benedict. All the answer which he could obtain was, "Let the King of France issue what ordinances he will, I will hold my title and my Popedom till I die." D'Ailly entreated him to consult his Cardinals.[n] In a full Consistory he delivered a long and persuasive Latin harangue. He then withdrew. The Cardinal of Amiens urged the inevitable necessity of submission to the determination of the Kings of France and Germany. Pope Benedict steadily refused; "he had been invested by God in his Papacy; he would not renounce it for Count, or Duke, or King." The Consistory was in tumult; almost all the Cardinals clamoured against him. The Bishop of Cambray entered again; he demanded an answer. "Pope I have written myself; Pope I have been acknowledged by all my subjects; Pope I will remain to the end of my days. And tell my son, the King of France, that I had thought him till now a good Catholic; he will repent of his errors. Warn him in my name not to bring trouble on his conscience." Such at Rome and at Avignon was the reply to overtures of peace.

At Avignon.

The Marshal Boucicaut in the meantime was gathering his forces around Avignon. The Provençal gentlemen, with Raymond de Turenne at their head, crowded to his banner. Expectation of the pillage of Avignon, with the Papal treasures, and the plunder of the luxurious villas of

Froissart, iv. 67. This mission was in 1398, before the Jubilee. Dupin, in his Life of Peter d'Ailly (Gersoni Opera, vol. i.), has omitted this journey to Rome, so vividly described by Froissart.

[n] See the picturesque description in Froissart, ibid., compared with other accounts.

the Cardinals, drew together men accustomed to fight in the Free Bands. The citizens of Avignon would have compelled the stubborn Pontiff to yield; the old man answered with dauntless courage, "I will summon the Gonfalonier of the Church, the King of Arragon, to my aid. I will raise troops along the Riviera as far as Genoa. What fear ye? Guard ye your city, I will guard my palace." But Avignon and the Cardinals capitulated at the first summons. The Pope shut himself up in his palace, and prepared for a resolute defence. He had laid in great store of provisions, grain, oil, wine: his fuel was burned by an accidental fire; he pulled down part of the buildings to cook the food. Boucicaut from awe, or in confident expectation that the Pontiff must soon submit, would not lead his soldiers to storm the strong Papal Palace. The Cardinals had fled again to Villeneuve; Pampeluna and Tarascon alone were still faithful to Benedict.

Pope besieged in his palace.

The Cardinals sent an embassy, three of their body, to the King. They urged the seizure of Pope Benedict, and that Boniface should be compelled by the same withdrawal of obedience to submit to the decree of a Council. They suggested their apprehensions lest Benedict should escape into the dominions of the King of Arragon, with whom he was connected by marriage. They neglected not their own interests; they stipulated that their own privileges, emoluments, expectatives should be religiously respected. None of the great benefices, bishoprics, or abbacies were to be filled till the union of the Church, the proceeds to be set apart to advance that object. The insolence, violence, and avarice of the Cardinals retarded rather than promoted peace. They were insulted in the streets of Paris.[o] The King began to wave. Instructions were sent to Boucicaut not to proceed against Benedict by force of arms, only to prevent his escape with the Papal treasures. The palace

Cardinals at Paris.

[o] "Et inde vulgares sumpserunt audaciam, ut cum issent ad palacia dominorum cum pomposo equitatu, eis conviciabantur, verba ignominiosa proferentes quæ cum maximâ indignatione audiebant."—Relig. de S. Denys, xix. p. 680.

was closely blockaded; Benedict's two Cardinals in an attempt to fly were seized and thrown into prison.

Benedict had in vain entreated succour from the King of Arragon. He had offered to make Barcelona or Perpignan the seat of the Papacy. "Does the priest think that for him I will plunge into a war with the King of France?" Such was the reply of Martin of Arragon. Benedict was constrained to capitulate. The harshest part of the terms was that they were to be enforced by the hostile Cardinals and by the wealthier burghers of Avignon. The Cardinals and the burghers pledged themselves to keep strict guard, that Benedict should not leave his palace: he was their prisoner.

Benedict capitulates.

It was remarked that throughout this contest Benedict employed not the spiritual sword. The Pope endured the siege without hurling anathemas on his foes.[p] His malediction could only have struck in general at the King and all his nobles; the interdict, had he dared to issue it, would have smitten the whole realm. But he knew the state of the Court of France, the insanity of the King, the implacable feud between the houses of Burgundy and Orleans. The withdrawal from his allegiance by one of the furious factions which divided the Court and Kingdom ensured the sympathy of the other. The Armagnacs and Burgundians, the rival Dukes, could not join in hatred or persecution of the same object. Who would know, in those superstitious times, whether the constant paroxysms of derangement which seized the King might not be attributed to the Papal excommunication? The two Augustinian Monks who had undertaken to cure the King's malady, having utterly failed in their mission, were arraigned for the impious magic, in which the kingdom had put its full faith, by the Bishop of Paris and the Clergy. They were beheaded at the Place de Grève as sorcerers, not as impostors; their quarters exposed to the insult and abhorrence of the furious populace.[q]

[p] "Nec aliqualiter usus fuit contra quenquam gladio spirituali, nam sciebat non a cunctis lilia deferentibus istas iniquitates procedere, cum multi illos dampnarent, sibi favorabiliter adhærentes."—Chronic. S Denys, xix. 8.

[q] Chron. de St. Denys. Sismondi, Hist. des Français.

For five years Benedict XIII. endured this humiliating imprisonment. The Cardinals kept jealous ward, A.D. 1398-1403. their vigilance was unwearied, unrelaxed. Yet Benedict could not be ignorant that the Duke of Orleans now publicly espoused his cause against the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry. The University of Toulouse had entered the lists against the University of Paris, and boldly arraigned the sacrilegious revolt from the one true Pope.[r] Louis, King of Sicily, forced his way to the presence of the Pope. His title to his throne depended on the Papal grant. Louis tendered his full and loyal allegiance to the successor of St. Peter. Benedict knew that his time was come. On a still evening, with the March 12, 1403. aid of a Norman gentleman, Robert de Braquemont, he stole in disguise out of the palace, unquestioned and unsearched by the guards. He passed the night in Avignon. The next morning he dropped down the Rhone to Château Rénaud, a strong fortress held by 500 soldiers of King Louis. His first act was to send for a barber; ever since he had been a prisoner he had let his beard grow.

Never was revulsion more rapid or complete. The abject prisoner of his own Cardinals, from whom half Christendom, the loyal half, had withdrawn their allegiance, was again the Pope of France and Spain. His two faithful Cardinals were at his side, the rest in trembling submission at his feet. They dared not disobey his summons. He entertained them at a sumptuous repast. In the midst of the festivity was heard the clang of arms; soldiers were seen with their gleaming halberds taking their stations in silence. The Cardinals sat in speechless terror. But Benedict desired only to show his power: at a sign they withdrew. The feast went on; but if a dark tradition be true, his mercy confined itself to churchmen. Two centuries and a half afterwards the ruins of a hall were shown, in which the Pope had given a banquet of reconciliation to some of the principal burghers of Avignon, and then set fire to the building and burned them all

[r] Dupuy, Hist. du Schisme.

alive.[s] Be this but an ancient legend, he compelled the citizens to rebuild the battered walls of the Papal palace: he garrisoned it with Arragonese soldiers. The
May 15. clergy of France had been again convoked in Paris. The Cardinals of Poitiers and of Saluces appeared to plead the cause of Benedict (the last time they had been his bitter adversaries). The Dukes of Burgundy, Berry, and Bourbon still held with the University of Paris, but the University of Paris was now divided. On a sudden appeared the Duke of Orleans, leading the King. It was a lucid interval in the melancholy state of the prince. Charles faltered out, at the suggestion of his brother, a declaration of his high opinion of the learning and virtue of Benedict. The Duke of Orleans took the Cross from the altar; the King laid his hands upon it, and declared that he restored to Benedict the allegiance of the realm of France: "so long as he lived he would acknowledge him alone as the Vicar of Christ." The faint gleam of doubtful reason in a madman was to determine who was the representative of God's Almightiness on earth! The Bishops burst into the chant of the Te Deum, the bells rang out. Paris knew by those pealing sounds that Benedict was again the successor of St. Peter.[t] The King's letters announced these glad tidings to the provinces. Benedict still, to the King, to the Duke of Orleans, to the whole kingdom, professed his eager desire to extinguish the Schism. In proof of his sincerity he sent an embassy to his rival at Rome. Boniface refused to receive the ambassadors but as Pope. The Bishop of S. Pons, Benedict's Legate, and his colleagues had the prudence to yield. They were received in full Consistory. They urged a free conference, at some appointed place, to
Feast of St. Michael. Sept. 29, 1404. discuss the rival claims. Boniface, perhaps suffering under his painful malady, the stone, answered with bitter pride, "that he alone was Pope, Peter di Luna an Antipope." "At least," rejoined the offended ambassadors, "our master is guiltless of simony."

[s] Bonché, Hist. de Provence, ii. 432. Sismondi, Hist. des Français, xii. p. 380.

[t] Compare Gersoniana, p. xvi. Dupin's abstract of these proceedings is full and fair.

The insult struck to the heart of Boniface. He retired to his chamber, and ere two days was dead.[u] Oct. 1.

[u] Dupuy, p. 90. Theodoric à Niem, ii. 23. We read in Ciacconius: "Fuit Bonifacius unus insigniorum et prudentissimorum Pontificum, quos unquam Roma vidit, et qui plus timoris, observantiæ et obedientiæ apud Romanos cives obtinuit." Of his avarice and rapacity, and other faults, of Christian virtues, he says nothing. See also his epitaph. Boniface had a complication of fearful maladies, of which the stone was the fatal one. This extraordinary story of a proposed cure of this malady rests on the authority of the Archbishop of Florence: "Multis vulgatum est quod cum secundum medicinam carnalem diceretur sibi, quod per coitum cum muliere liberaretur a calculo, ex quo decessit, minimè acquiescere voluit tanto sacrilegio contra divinam legem, eligens potius mori quam impudicè vivere."—S. Antonin. Chronicon, sub ann. Compare, on the other hand, Gobelinus Persona, who hates Boniface as cordially as he flattered Urban VI. Gobelinus, now in Germany, saw the workings of the avarice and rapacity of Boniface. Boniface absolutely annulled all and every one of his own acts, grants, indulgences, and dispensations, and those of his predecessors (read the whole 87th chapter), it should seem, to regrant for five years with new fees. Of his death he says, "Et sic quamvis torsionibus intolerabilibus cotidiè quatitur, tamen aurum sitire non desinit."—P. 323.

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT VII. GREGORY XII. BENEDICT XIII.

Submission to a foreign Pontiff was the last thought of the Italian Cardinals. There were only eight[a] in Rome. They solemnly swore that whosoever of them should be chosen would abdicate the Popedom so soon as Benedict should do the same. This oath was taken by Cosmo Innocent VII. Oct. 12, 1404. Migliorotto, who was elected, and assumed the name of Innocent VII. The ambassadors of Benedict demanded their safe conduct, as accredited only to Pope Boniface. They had been seized; they were forced to buy their release from the Commander in the Castle of St. Angelo.[b]

Innocent VII. had too much virtue, gentleness, and humanity for these tumultuous times.[c] His first year was a year of purgatory in the Conclave. The Cardinals, headed by the Cardinal of Montpellier, would not abandon the good old profitable usages of simony. But he had to encounter more terrible enemies. Nothing can redound more to the praise at least of the firm and resolute policy of Boniface than the fierce outbreak immediately after his Insurrection at Rome. death. The Guelfs and Ghibellines, awed by his stern conduct, had crouched in sullen repose. Innocent had hardly time to return to the safe Vatican Palace from his coronation in the Lateran, when Rome rose in tumult to demand the restoration of the Bannerets, and the surrender of the city to their rule. Two Colonnas, one Savelli, hastened from the fortresses in the neighbourhood to inflame the insurrection against the Papal Govern-

[a] Seven, Ciacconius; nine, Oldoin. I make out eight. Gobelinus gives seven names.

[b] Dupuy, p. 90.

[c] Theodoric à Niem, ii. 34. He writes to the Archbishop of York, announcing his election, and hopes that the "desiderabilis unionis tranquillitas" may ensue on his accession.—MS. B. M., Dec. 27, 1404.

ment.[d] The Orsini were the hereditary defenders of the ecclesiastical authority. There were all the evils and miseries of a Roman insurrection — palaces pillaged, matrons and virgins violated.

Ladislaus King of Naples was in the city at the accession of Innocent; he was leagued with the Ghibellines, but the champion of liberty brooded over designs fatal to liberty. He was now almost undisputed sovereign of the realm of Naples. He aspired to include Rome within his dominions. The yielding Pope endeavoured to purchase the friendship, he averted the open hostility of Ladislaus, by the cession, for a certain number of years, of the Maremma. The King of Naples interposed his mediation between the Pope and the people. But the terms betrayed at once his power and his inclinations. 20,000 florins from the tax on salt, which belonged to the Papal exchequer, were awarded to the people. The Pope held the Castle of St. Angelo (Murchardon, a famous condottiere, commanded the garrison), the Capitol was surrendered to the people. The Tiber flowed between the city of the Church and the city of the people. The Senator was to be named by the Pope out of three prescribed by the people. Ten magistrates, called the Ten of Liberty, were to be renewed every two months.[e] Ladislaus of Naples.

The Pope still endeavoured to maintain a popular policy. In a creation of Cardinals, five were Romans; but the emissaries of Ladislaus were still active. A dispute arose, which led to armed strife, about the fort which commanded the Ponte Molle, and so all the northern approaches to Rome. A deputation of the people, among which were some of the most audacious and most popular leaders, two of the captains of the regions,[f] entered the Castle of St, Angelo. Ludovico Megliorotto, the nephew of the Pope, a bold, fiery man, an intimate associate of Murchardon the commander of the Papal troops, would not endure their plebeian insolence. As they departed, he fell on them, eleven were killed.[g] Their bodies were

[d] "Quod urbicolæ per ecclesiam non per cives regerentur."—A Niem.

[e] Sozomen, apud Muratori, S. R. I. t. xvi. Raynaldus has the treaty sub ann. 1404.

[f] Capi di Rioni.

[g] The murder was committed in a house, "ubi habitabat mater Bonifacii." The bodies were thrown out of

left till night reeking on the pavement. There they were seen by Leonardo Aretino (the historian), who made his way with difficulty to the presence of the Pope. He found the old man, who was entirely guiltless of all connivance in the act, in the deepest depression and horror. He lifted his eyes to heaven, as though to call God to witness his innocence.[h]

Sept. 5, 1405.

The bell of the Capitol tolled out; the people rose to vengeance: all the palaces of the Cardinals and courtiers were pillaged. The Pope and Cardinals with difficulty fled to Viterbo. The Pope had almost perished of thirst. The Abbot of St. Peter's was murdered in his sight, as also another of his Court; their bodies were cast in the highway. John of Colonna took possession of the Vatican; the arms of the Pope were defaced or covered with mud. The Colonna was ironically called John XXIII.

Flight of the Pope.

Ladislaus thought that his hour was come. His troops were under the walls; he hoped to hear himself welcomed as Lord of Rome. The Colonnas, the Savellis, some other Barons were prepared to raise the cry. His troops found their way into the city, and began to sack the houses.[i] But the turbulent people had not cast out the Pope to submit to a king and a stranger.[k] The whole city was a great battle-field. The soldiers of Ladislaus set fire to it in four quarters; but at length, after great slaughter, the King abandoned his desperate enterprise, his discomfited troops withdrew. With more than their usual versatility, Rome had her ambassadors at Viterbo imploring the return of Pope Innocent,[m] offering to recognise his plenary dominion,[n] and laying at his feet the keys of the city. Innocent was again Lord of Rome. He waited about two months, he was received in triumph. Three months after he issued his Bull of Excommunication against King Ladislaus and the Colonnas.

Return to Rome.

the window, and lay near the Amila, where the Veronica was commonly shown.—Diarium Anton. Petri. Murat. R. I. S. xxiv. p. 917.

[h] Leonard. Aretin. Comm. xxx. p. 922.

[i] "Posuit ad sacchum totam Romam."—Diarium Petri. He was master of three Rioni.

[k] "E benchè li Colonnesi, e li Savelli, e alcuni altri Baroni el volessero, tutto il popolo no'l voleva."—Piero Minorbetto, apud Tartini, sub ann. 1405.

[m] Theodoric à Niem, ii. 38.

[n] "Dominium totius Romæ."

Ambassadors from King Ladislaus were at his footstool. Peace was made; the Castle of St. Angelo surrendered. In the same month, in the year after he had fled from Rome, Innocent departed from this dismal world to the quiet grave.[o] Death.

The Schism could not terminate with the death of either Pope. The Roman Cardinals could not acknowledge Benedict unconditionally without condemning their own obstinate resistance, or without vitiating their succession, and imperilling their title to the Cardinalate. An ecclesiastical head was necessary for the assertion of the ecclesiastical dominion in Rome:[p] it would have been wrested at once, perhaps for ever, by the turbulent people from the feeble and disunited grasp of the Cardinals. Nov. 30. Fifteen Cardinals met in Conclave. Again they administered, and all took, an oath of unusual rigour,[q] that whoever might be elected Pope would at once renounce the Papacy, directly his rival at Avignon would consent to the same abjuration. Of all the fifteen, none seemed to take this oath with more promptitude and sincerity, none had for years so deeply deplored the Schism, or urged all measures for its termination so earnestly, as Angelo Corario, a Venetian by birth, now verging on eighty years of age. On his election as Gregory XII., in public and in private Corario seized every opportunity of expressing, in the strongest words, the same determination.[r] "His only fear was lest he should not live to accomplish the holy work." At his coronation he was seen to weep when he renewed this protestation; it was the one subject of his grave sermon. In private he declared, that for the union of the Church, if he had not a Gregory XII.

[o] The dates seem to be:—Dominion offered to the Pope, Jan. 14 (1406). Return of the Pope, March 13. Anathema on Ladislaus and the Colonnas, June 18. Ambassadors from Ladislaus, July 17. Peace, Aug. 6. Castle of St. Angelo surrendered, Aug. 9. Death of Innocent, Nov. 13.

[p] Theodoric à Niem, iii. See in the Stimmen aus Rom (on this book more hereafter) the curious account by the ambassador of the Teutonic Order of the turbulent state of Rome. His house was seized by some of the mercenary soldiers; he could not get them out, and was obliged to share it with them. He was summoned to do homage to the new Pope, but was afraid to venture through the streets.

[q] The oath is in Oldoin. Addit. ad Ciacconium, p. 755; and in à Niem, iii. 2.

[r] "Me præsente," says à Niem.

galley, he would embark in the smallest boat; if without a horse, he would set out on foot with his staff.[s] He refused to grant expectatives. His first act was a letter, of which the superscription might seem offensive, "to Peter di Luna, whom some nations during this miserable schism call Benedict XIII." The rest was respectful, earnest: no sacrifice could be too great for the reunion of the Church. "The mother before King Solomon was their example; to save her son's life she had ceased to be a mother. This they should do for the Church." Benedict, from Marseilles, replied with the same superscription, "to Angelo Corario, whom some in this pernicious schism name Gregory XII." The Spaniard vied with his rival in Rome in the fervour of his words: he offered to receive ambassadors with the utmost respect. "Haste, delay not, consider our age, the shortness of life, embrace at once the way of salvation and peace, that we may appear with our united flock before the Great Shepherd." Each pledged himself to create no new Cardinals, unless to keep up their equal numbers. Gregory's pacific letters to the King of France were read with joy and admiration; he was held to be an angel of light.[t]

A.D. 1407. Meeting appointed at Savona.

Savona, on the Riviera of Genoa,[u] was named as the place where the rival Popes were to meet, each to depose himself, and to remit the election of the one supreme Pontiff to the united College of Cardinals. Ambassadors from Genoa arrived at Rome in May, offering safe conduct, protection, the temporary cession of the city of Savona, to be occupied half by each Pope. Ambassadors arrived also from the King of France and the University of Paris.

But already to the jealous ears of some about his Court

[s] See the letter addressed to Christendom by the Cardinals at Pisa.—A Niem, Nemus Unionis, vi. 11.

[t] In the MS. B. M. is a letter addressed to the clergy and nobility of the whole Christian world, in which he describes himself as "ad extirpationem inveterati ac lugubris et pestiferi schismatis paternis et solicitis studiis intendentes."

[u] He writes to Henry IV. of England, as one "quem unionis hujusmodi accipimus ardentissimum zelatorem," announces the agreement for meeting at Savona, and solicits a subsidy, without which he cannot move; he urges Henry "subventionis munus extendere de tuâ regali munificentiâ." Rome, June 1, 1407. He writes, too, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, soliciting a subsidy.

the language of Gregory had become suspicious.[x] He spoke, not perhaps without some ground, of the insecurity of Savona, which, as the French King now ruled in Genoa, was subject to him as its temporal lord, and in spiritual affairs owned the sway of Benedict. The advancement of one of his three nephews—ambitious, unpopular men—to the office of President of the Papal Chamber,[y] and the reception of magnificent presents from Ladislaus of Naples, threw darkening doubts on his sincerity. The confessor of King Ladislaus, a Franciscan of great worldly ability, was admitted to the confidence, and never quitted the person of the Pope. The ambiguous movements of the King and of the Pope increased the perplexity. The King's troops suddenly appeared within the walls of Rome. John of Colonna joined them. The Pope, whom some supposed to be in secret league with the King, retired, it was given out, in fear, but in slow pomp, into the Castle of St. Angelo. But the soldiers of Colonna committed some brutal outrages in a nunnery, and plundered some shops. The people rose, headed by Paolo Orsini, who commanded the Papal troops. The assailants fell into an ambush; Nicolas Colonna and other leaders were taken and beheaded in the Capitol. Gregory put on the appearance of great joy at the discomfiture of Ladislaus; but men mistrusted his joy.

Doubtful conduct of the Pope.

June 17.

The month had not elapsed before Pope Gregory set off from Rome in state—in pontifical state, it seemed —on the holy mission of restoring peace to the distracted Church. He remained two months at Viterbo: in September he moved to Sienna. Michaelmas was the appointed time for the meeting at Savona.

Vigil of St. Lawrence.

Aug. 9. Viterbo.

Sept. Sienna.

Then began the long and weary tergiversation, the subtle excuse, the suggestion of difficulty after difficulty, the utter neglect and abandonment of all his lofty pro-

[x] Theodoric à Niem, iii. The cause of à Niem's rancorous hatred of Gregory may possibly have been personal, but his writings have a character of honesty, though full of passion. They are in general supported by other documents. Gregorius he calls throughout "Errorius."

[y] Camerarius.

testations, the tampering with, the breach of, the most solemn oaths. His more inveterate enemies taunt him as a hoary hypocrite:[z] he is exculpated only as a weak old man, wrought upon by his rapacious and ambitious kindred.[a] His first act, the alienation of some great estates of the Church for the endowment of his three nephews, might pass as only a prudent provision in case the Papacy should be adjudged away from him.[b] There may have been ground for some other of his manifold excuses: that Venice did not furnish the galleys which alone could make him a match for the fleets of Genoa at the command of Benedict; that the land journey through Lombardy, to the friendly territory of the Marquis of Montferrat, was perilous on account of the wars raging in that district; that he was in want of money to meet his rival in equal magnificence.[c] A large sum was borrowed from Florence, to be forcibly reimbursed by the clergy of that city; the clergy of Rome were wrung by the unrelenting exactions of Paolo Orsini; sacred furniture and vessels were sold. All this embittered and exasperated the clergy. But deeper and more powerful influences were at work. The kindred of the Pope would not hazard his supremacy. With King Ladislaus his title to Naples hung on the perpetuation of the Schism, at least on the maintenance of the Italian Pontiff. If there was a French Pope, a French King of Naples was inevitable.[d] Gregory, while he seemed to anathematise, was ruled by Ladislaus. He still professed the profoundest solicitude for the conference, but he still raised new impediments. Monks and friars preached

[z] Theodoric à Niem.

[a] Leonard. Aretin. "Nos de Pontifice nullo modo credimus, de propinquis non dubitamus." The acts are certain.

[b] One was to have Faenza, another Forlì, a third Vobeto, in Tuscany; they were also to have the noble city and port of Corneto: the grants for these alienations were made, but not fulfilled. —A Niem, c. xxi.

[c] See in the Stimmen aus Rom the difficulty of dealing with Gregory XII. He refused to confirm the ordinary decrees and compacts of his predecessor. He is unmanageable on such litigated points, for he is unlearned in the canon law, and always thinks that he is being cheated. Yet he will do everything himself, even the business usually despatched by the Cardinals. He grants no graces; all must depart with their affairs unsettled. In one week he had 2000 supplications, all of which were crammed into a bag, hardly ten of them were ever got out and signed.—P. 152.

[d] "Veretur nunc ut abdicatione facta, et utroque collegio ad electionem coeunte, Gallicus forte aliquis ad pontificatum sumatur, qui favorem in regno obtinendo in Ludovicum convertat."—Leonard. Aretin. Epist.

openly against his cowardly abandonment of his incontestable rights. If Gregory and his Cardinals went to Savona, they would be murdered, such was the notorious determination of the odious Benedict. Those who urged the immediate accomplishment of his vows were coldly heard, or put to silence. The negotiations dragged on. Gregory, in a long statement, raised twenty-two objections to Savona; he insisted on some town in the occupation of a neutral power. Carrara was named, Lucca, Pisa, Leghorn. Benedict saw the advantage of advancing on his tardier rival; he moved to Porto Venere, afterwards to Spezia. Gregory to Lucca. They were not more than fifteen leagues asunder; but the one, like a water animal, would not leave the sea-shore—the other, a land animal, would not approach the sea.[e] Delays.

So closed one year; another began. Towards the spring Ladislaus advanced on Rome with 15,000 men. He was admitted into the city with the secret connivance of Paolo Orsini.[f] He gave out that he came to protect Rome from a descent meditated by the fleet at the command of Benedict. Of this descent Gregory had more than once declared his apprehension. He almost avowed his joy at this aggressive act of Ladislaus; the design of Benedict, which he assumed as unquestionable, justified all his caution. Marshal Boucicaut had, in truth, thirteen galleys, destined for the mouth of the Tiber, to protect the city of Rome from the King of Naples; but they were kept in port by stress of weather. Ladislaus was not content with Rome; he still advanced; Perugia, Orta, Amelia, Todi, Reate, submitted to his sway.[g] 1407, 1408. Ladislaus in Rome. April 25.

The weary negotiations had gone languishing on. Gregory offered at one time to abdicate the Papacy, if he might retain his old titular dignity of Patriarch of Con-

[e] Leonard. Aretin. p. 926.

[f] See the account of the entrance of Ladislaus into Rome (April 25), the public joy, the peace, abundance, and cheapness of provisions.—Nemus Unionis, vi. c. 9. "Ita quod in genere omnes contentantur de dominio regis, *exceptis forsan aliquibus Romanis habentibus gravamen.*" All the armed men on the other side were expelled from the city.

[g] Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1408. Nemus Unionis, vi. c. 27.

stantinople, two bishoprics in his native territory Venice, with the English archbishopric of York, then expected to fall vacant.[h] But there was now a sudden and total rupture. Gregory reassumed the unlimited Pontifical power. He declared his determination, in direct violation of the compact, to create four new Cardinals—two of his nephews, his Protonotary, and Brother John the Dominican, Bishop elect of Ragusa, a man odious on all accounts,[i] now especially so, as having not only secretly urged, but openly preached the sole indefeasible popedom of Gregory.[k] The old Cardinals were summoned to his presence. They sat in mournful stillness; they heard the Pope condescend to communicate his purpose. One broke out, "Let us die first." Another fell at his feet. Defiance, protest, entreaty, moved not the impenetrable old man. He heard that they were meditating flight to Pisa. At the same time came forth a Bull for the creation of the four Cardinals, and an inhibition to the rest to leave Lucca. Paolo Guinigi, Lord of Lucca, interposed; he refused to permit any violence to be used against the Cardinals. They withdrew to Pisa: there they published an appeal to a General Council. Their taunting address[m] reminded the Pope of his vow to go on foot with his staff to accomplish the union of the Church. They asserted that they had been in danger, if not of their lives, of imprisonment in noisome dungeons: manacles and fetters had been prepared in the Pope's palace.[n] Gregory could not be silent. He haughtily declared them unworthy of

Cardinals at Pisa.

[h] A Niem, c. xxi.

[i] See the letter from Satan to this Fra Joanne Dominico, wishing him "salutem et superbiam sempiternam." —A Niem, Nemus Unionis, vi. 29. This Nemus Unionis is a very curious collection of documents made by Theodoric à Niem, selected perhaps in hostility to Gregory XII., but neither invented nor falsified. "In hoc nemore laborantibus hypocrisis Veneta (of Gregory XII.) argutia Cathalonica (Benedict XIII.) versutia Sicula (Ladislaus) fallacia Genuensis, elegantia Gallica, sinceritas Theutonica, et æquitas Portugallica obviabant."—In Præf.

[k] See Nemus Unionis, tract. iv. c. 4, for the arguments against the cession of Gregory. "XV. Quia sic privarentur Italici injustè tanto honore Sedis Apostolicæ et Ecclesia transferretur ad Gallicos, ad Avinionenses. XVI. Quia Italici post renunciationem divulgabuntur per universum orbem terrarum insensati, vecordes, ignari, quia tantam gloriam Papatus perdiderunt: et Gallici prædicabuntur sensati, animosi, sapientes, quia licet falsum Papam habuissent tamen vicerunt." It was a strife of Italy and France for the Popedom. Compare iv. 8.

[m] Dated May 14.

[n] Apud Raynald. sub ann.

reply; but he did reply. He accused them of secret and suspicious conversations with the French ambassador and those of Peter di Luna. He utterly denied all designs against their lives and liberties. They alleged, he said, that they had sworn to go to Pisa, but not to go without the Pope.°

Christendom had beheld with indignation this miserable game of chicanery, stratagem, falsehood, perjury, played by two old men, each above seventy years old. But the great European kingdoms were too much divided, too much agitated by intestine disunion, to act together in this momentous common cause. Benedict XIII., taking courage from the more tardy movements and more glaring violation of faith in his adversary, seemed resolved to assert his Papal title by an act of Papal arrogance. France had threatened to stand neutral and to withdraw her allegiance from both Popes. Benedict presumed no doubt on the state of affairs, the hopeless derangement of the King, the deadly feud still raging between the houses of Burgundy and Orleans. A Christian preacher had startled even the low morality of that age, by vindicating the assassination of the Duke of Orleans. He prepared two Bulls: one, the more violent, had been drawn up in the year 1407; one during the present year, in a more mitigated tone. Both, however, arraigned the King of France, more or less directly, as under the seduction of the devil, and as inflaming the Schism in the Church. All who were guilty of this crime, even though clothed in the highest temporal or spiritual dignity, he pronounced under excommunication—excommunication from which they could be absolved only by the Pope himself, and on the bed of death. Their kingdoms were threatened with interdict. The milder Bull, more distinctly addressed to the King of France, expostulated with him as a father with a dis-

Indignation of Christendom.

Benedict's letter of excommunication.

° Read the letter of the University of Paris to the Cardinals at Pisa: "Superfluum putamus referre, quoties requisitæ fuerunt dilationes, refutationes, et illusiones quibus jam orbem fatigaverunt. . . . Credimus neminem tam improbum, tam perditum, tamque eorum similem inveniri posse, qui posthac eos defendendos arbitraretur, nisi forsitan is fuerit, quem eadem infausti schismatis cognatio in damnatam hæresim demerserit."—Nemus Unionis, vi. 15.

obedient son, but warned him against those awful censures.[p]

The Pope's messengers were instructed to deliver these Bulls into the King's hands, and to return with all speed. They were apprehended and thrown into prison. The King was sane enough to assemble nobles, prelates, some members of the parliament, and deputies from the University of Paris. John Courtcuisse, a distinguished theo-
Monday, May 21, 1408. logian, delivered a sermon on the text, "His iniquity shall fall on his own head." He exhibited thirteen articles against Peter di Luna, called Benedict XIII. He charged him with perjury, for not fulfilling his vow of abdication; with heresy, as having asserted that the Pope would be guilty of a deadly sin, if he should renounce the Popedom, even to restore unity in the Church of God.[q] The Bulls were declared illegal, treasonable, injurious to the King's majesty. The King gave his assent to the prayer, and commanded the Chancellor, the famous Gerson, to "do what was right." Gerson tore the Bulls in two; one half he gave to the nobles, one to the prelates and the delegates of the University; they rent them into shreds.[r] The Pope's messengers, some days after, were brought forth in black linen dresses, on which, on one side, were painted themselves presenting the Bulls to the King; on the other the Pope's arms reversed. They had paper crowns on their heads, with the inscription, "Traitors to the Church and to the King." They were placed on a high scaffold, and exhibited to the scorn and derision of the people. They were sent back to perpetual imprisonment; one got away after three years.[s]

The inexorable University pursued its triumph; some of the highest and most learned prelates of the realm were assailed as being favourable to Peter di Luna. The King's proclamation was published in Italy, announcing

[p] The superscription was "Domino Regi et omnibus Dominis de sanguine et concilio."—Gersoniana, xxii.

[q] See the account of John de Courtecuisse (Breviscoxa) in Dupin's Gersoniana, p. xl. There is a long treatise of Courtecuisse on the Pope and General Councils in the first volume of Gerson's works. Courtecuisse was Bishop of Paris, A.D. 1420.

[r] Dupuy, p. 148.

[s] Dupuy, 137.

the neutrality of France, asserting the perjury, treachery, heresy of both Popes. All churches were called on to abandon Angelo Corario and Peter di Luna. The Marshal Boucicaut had orders to seize the person of Benedict XIII., but Benedict had his galleys ready: he set sail, and arrived safe at Perpignan. Gregory took refuge in the territories of his native Venice.

CHAPTER V.

COUNCIL OF PISA.

GREGORY XII., BENEDICT XIII., ALEXANDER V., AND JOHN XXIII.

THE mutual fear and mistrust of the rival Popes was their severest self-condemnation. These grey-headed Prelates, each claiming to be the representative of Christ upon earth, did not attempt to disguise from the world that neither had the least reliance on the truth, honour, justice, religion of his adversary. Neither would scruple to take any advantage of the other; neither would hesitate at any fraud, or violence, or crime; neither would venture within the grasp of the other, from the avowed apprehension for his liberty or his life. The forces at the command of each must be exactly balanced; the cities or sovereigns in whose territories they were to meet must guarantee, or give hostages for their personal security. They deliberately charged each other with the most nefarious secret designs, as well as with equivocation, evasion, tampering with sacred oaths, perjury.

Benedict in Spain. Gregory in Venetian territory.

The College of Cardinals, not only by their great public act, the summoning on their own authority a full independent Council, but even more offensively by the language of their addresses to the Popes, from whom they had severally revolted, and those to the Kings and nations of Christendom, condemned both. Each arraigned the Pope whom he had till now honoured as the successor of St. Peter as guilty of the most odious and contemptible conduct, falsehood, perjury, obstinate adherence to a fatal and damnable Schism. The two parties met at Leghorn; the four Cardinals, who either of their own free will, or under compulsion, had accompanied Benedict to Perpignan, had found their way to Italy; the eight who had abandoned Gregory at Lucca—Naples, Aquileia, Colonna, Orsini, Brancaccio, Ravenna, Lucca,

Cardinals summon Council.

St. Angelo.[a] There they determined to assume, as the senate of Christendom, a dictatorial power over their Sovereign; and to call on their own authority, without the sanction of the Pope or the Emperor, the famous Council of Pisa. Strong measures must be justified by strong asseverations of their necessity. The Popes, thus superseded in the highest branch of their authority, and made amenable to a new tribunal, must first be surrendered to general aversion and scorn. The Cardinals in the *obedience* of Benedict XIII.[b] (new terms were required to express new relations) maintained in their summons to their Pope some words of respect. They addressed him as Pope; they spoke of his rival as Angelo Corario. But in their letter to the King of France and to the Universities, and in the circulars addressed to Christendom, he was, as the author and maintainer of the Schism, wicked as the Jews and the heathen soldiers who would rend the seamless robe of Christ. His utter insincerity, his artifices, his obstinacy, his contempt of his oaths, were exposed in unambiguous words.[c] The Cardinals in the obedience of Gregory were more unmeasured in their reproaches. On the instant of their secession or escape from Lucca, the city walls were lined with a fierce satire against Gregory, in which invective and ridicule vied in bitterness.[d] It purported to be a summons not only from the Cardinals,

[a] H. Minutolo, a Neapolitan, Cardinal of Tusculum.
Antonio Gaetani, a Roman, C. Prænestе.
Odo Colonna, Roman, C. S. George in Velabro.
Giordano Orsini, Roman, C. S. Silvester and S. Martin.
Raynold Brancaccio, Neapolitan, S. Vitus and Modestus.
John de Megliorotto, of Sulmona, C. S. Croce.
Angelo Somaripa, of Lodi, C. S. Pudentiana.
Peter Stefaneschi, Roman, of St. Angelo.

[b] Guy de Malesicco, a Poitevin, C. of Prænestе.
Nicolas Brancaccio, Neapolitan, C. Albano.
John de Brogniac, Frenchman, C. of Ostia.
Peter G. Dupuy, Frenchman, C. of Tusculum.
Peter de Thurcy, Frenchman, C. S. Susanna.
Amadeo of Saluzzo, Piedmontese, C. S. Maria Nuova.
Angelo di S. Anna, Neapolitan.
The Cardinals of Milan, Peter Philargi of Candia, afterwards Pope Alexander V., and De Baro, a Spaniard, Cardinal of S. Agatha, soon appeared. Then the Cardinals of Bourdeaux, of Urbino, and De Frias, Cardinal of Spain.

[c] Dachery, Spicilegium, i. 818.

[d] This placard is in the work of à Niem. It is entitled Epistola Delusoria. L'Enfant supposes that it was really the work of the Cardinals. It is manifestly a furious satire against all parties, perhaps by à Niem himself.—L'Enfant, Concile de Pise, i. p. 235.

but from all the officers of the Papal Court down to the grooms of the kitchen and stable; it summoned Gregory to appear in Lucca on a certain day, to be degraded not only as a man of blood, without honour, the slave of his carnal affections, but as a drunkard, a madman, a proclaimed heretic, a subverter of the Church of God, an accursed hypocrite. It deposed all his adherents, especially his four new Cardinals.[e]

Their avowed proclamations were hardly more seemly in language. They darkly described and attributed to him and to his adversary all the evils of the Schism. They had chosen him as the best and most holy of their order; he had sworn deeply, repeatedly, solemnly, to extinguish the Schism by renunciation; he had afterwards declared such renunciation diabolic and damnable, as though he had taken the keys of St. Peter only to acquire the power of perjuring himself, and of giving free licence of perjury to others.[f]

The rival Popes were too well aware of the authority which a General Council would exercise over the mind of Christendom not to make a desperate effort to secure that authority in their own favour. They made all haste to anticipate the Council of Pisa, which the Cardinals with more dignified tardiness had summoned for the Lady-day in the following year. Benedict collected a hasty but somewhat imposing assembly at Perpignan.[g] It was said to have been attended by nine Cardinals, by four Prelates, invested for the occasion with the venerable titles of the four Patriarchs of the East. There were the Archbishops of Toledo, Saragossa, Tarragona; many Bishops from Arragon, Castile, and the other kingdoms of Spain, Savoy, Lorraine, still in the obedience of Benedict XIII. The Scotch Bishops had not time, or were

Benedict's Council at Perpignan. Nov. 1, 1408.

[e] Compare in the Nemus Unionis à Niem's correspondence with one of the Cardinals; his address to the Pope (was it delivered?), and his description of the perplexity of the courtiers, who held fat benefices: "plerique eorum remanent nobiscum et non nobiscum, timore perditionis dictorum beneficiorum non amore." A Niem had no benefice, and could speak boldly and freely. He quotes, "Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator," vi. c. 23.

[f] Raynaldus, A.D. 1408, No. xxxiii.

[g] L'Enfant, Concile de Pise, i. 221. Martene, Anecdot. ii. 1476. A Niem, De Schismate, iii. 37. Aguerre, Concil. Hispan.

prevented from attendance. There were even some Prelates from France, notwithstanding the declaration of the King and Parliament of their absolute neutrality, and although the Archbishop of Auch had been deposed, and the Archbishop of Rheims himself had fallen into disgrace for his obstinate resistance to the will of the King and of the nation. The assembly at Perpignan assumed all the formalities of an Œcumenic Council; but the event answered neither these lofty pretensions, nor the bold hopes of Benedict. Violent disputes arose as to the course which they should counsel the Pope to pursue. The higher dignitaries gradually shrunk away, till the Pope was left with but eighteen Prelates. The final deliberations of this remnant of a Council, with their results, are among the irreconcileable contradictions of this period. By most accounts Benedict consented to send ambassadors with certain powers and instructions to Pisa. Some of them were arrested at Nismes by order of the King of France; the Archbishop of Tarragona with others hardly escaped stoning by the populace at Pisa. On their application for passports the Cardinal Legate of Bologna declared that if he found them in the city with or without passports he would burn them alive. Yet among the charges presented against Benedict in the Council of Constance, he is affirmed to have treated his own Council with contemptuous harshness, and to have repelled them from his presence. He certainly retired to the strong fortress of Peniscola, and there in sullen dignity awaited the event.

Gregory's proposed Council was even more inglorious; it had not where to hold its humble state.[h] No one great city was open to the poor old Pontiff. Rome was in the possession of King Ladislaus, who in outward friendship with Gregory, was making suspicious advances to the Council of Pisa. Florence held a synod of her own, condemnatory of both Popes. The Council of Pisa was in her territories, under her protection. The Cardi- Gregory's Council.

[h] See MS. B. M. Summons to the Irish Church to send the Bishops of Waterford and Lismore to the General Council. Sienna, Aug. 13, 1408. Gregory XII. sends the Cardinal Bishop of Porto, Legate to England and Ireland. He could be ill spared from the College of Cardinals. But the mission was of paramount importance. Jan. 17, 1409.

nal Legate, that Legate Balthasar Cossa, was Tyrant of Bologna: he looked to rule for his own ends the Council of Pisa. The learned University of Bologna declared against both Popes; his native Venice would not embark in the desperate cause of her countryman Angelo Corario; her grave ambassadors gave cold counsel to the Pope to submit and renounce his dignity. Ravenna, Aquileia, Capua, even Ephesus, then for a brief time in the occupation of the Christians, were named. At length in an obscure corner of the Venetian territory, at Ciudad in the Friuli, a few Prelates were gathered to assert the indefeasible right of the old deserted Gregory XII.; to hear his feeble murmurs of anathema against his antagonists. But this was after the Council of Pisa had held her sittings.[1]

That Council of Pisa rose in imposing superiority above these secluded and fugitive conciliabules, as they were tauntingly called. Under the stately nave of the Cathedral in that city, where the aspiring Lombard or rather Italian architecture has lifted the roof to a majestic height yet unequalled in Italy, even by Gothic Assisi, and supported it on tall harmonious pillars (even now the noblest model of the Italian Basilica, expanded into the Latin cross); where over the altar hovered the vast and solemn picture of our Lord with the Virgin on one side St. John on the other, in which Cimabue made the last and most splendid effort of the old rigid Byzantine art to retain its imperilled supremacy; and thus Latin Christianity seemed to assert its rights against Teutonic independence before their final severance: beneath these auspices met the most august assembly as to the numbers and rank of the Prelates, and the Ambassadors of Christian Kings, which for centuries had assumed the functions of a representative Senate of Christendom. At first fourteen Cardinals, seven in each obedience, took their seats; the number grew to twenty-one or two, and finally, on the arrival of the Legate of Bologna with three others, to twenty-six; four Patriarchs — Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Grado. Twelve Archbishops, eighty Bishops appeared in person; fourteen Archbishops and a hundred and two Bishops by

[1] Labbe, Concilia. A Niem, De Schismate. L'Enfant, i. p. 295.

their procurators.[k] Eighty-seven Abbots, among the Cistercians those of Clairvaux, Grammont, Camaldoli, represented each his order; there were the Procurators of two hundred more; those of the Præmonstratensians and of St. Antony in Vienne appeared for all their Order with forty-one Priors; the Generals of the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, Augustinians, the Grand Master of Rhodes, the Prior of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, the Proctor General of the Teutonic Knights. The Universities sent their delegates—Paris, Toulouse, Orleans, Angers, Montpellier, Bologna, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Oxford, Cambridge; as did the Chapters of a hundred Metropolitan and Collegiate churches. There were three hundred Doctors of Theology and of Canon Law. The hierarchy of France were in the largest numbers; but Italy, Germany represented by the Procurators of the Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Saltzburg, and Magdeburg, and England by those of Canterbury, York, London, Winchester, and many others, by the Bishops of Salisbury (the famous Robert Hallam), St. David's, Carlisle, perhaps Chichester—added their weight, as did Poland and Hungary. Even Spain had one or two Bishops. There were also ambassadors from the Kings of France, England, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, Cyprus; from the Dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, Pomerania, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Thuringia, and many other German Princes. The Kings of Spain alone stood aloof as not having renounced the allegiance of Benedict, to whom also the Kings of Hungary, Scotland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark gave a doubtful support. Ladislaus of Naples alone adhered to Gregory, from enmity to Florence rather than from friendship to the Pope. The Emperor Robert—or rather the claimant of the empire, elected on the deposition of Wenceslaus, whose indefeasible title was still acknowledged in some parts of Germany—alone of sovereign princes by his ambassadors contested the legality of the Council, its self-con-

[k] There are considerable variations in the lists, as published in D'Achery, in Raynaldus, and by L'Enfant. Compare L'Enfant, i. pp. 239, 240.

stituted authority, and its right of adjudication in the cause of two Popes, one of whom must be the legitimate Pontiff.

Proceedings of the Council.

The Council conducted its proceedings with grave regularity, or rather (there were rare exceptions) with dispassionate dignity. It seemed profoundly impressed with the sense of its own unprecedented position, and the extraordinary and dictatorial power which it had been compelled to assume contrary to the usage of the last centuries. The assertion of the supremacy of a General Council, of a Council unsummoned by the Pope, was a doctrine which needed the boldness, authority, learning, and weight of such men as Gerson, the Chancellor of Paris,[m] to vindicate. The Treatise of that all-honoured man was acknowledged as the one work which contained and summed up with irrefragable force and erudition the arguments in favour of the Council.[n]

The Council met on Lady-day; but, in the commencement of the fifteenth century, that almost holiest of days must not be profaned by business even of that solemn importance. At the close of the first formal session on the next day, proclamation was made at the gates of the Cathedral, demanding whether Peter di Luna or Angelo Corario were present, either by themselves, their Cardinals, or Procurators. Three times on successive days this citation was repeated; at the close, neither Peter di Luna nor Angelo Corario making answer, they were pronounced in contumacy. The prelates and ambassadors from the more distant lands arrived but slowly; the Council occupied its time with sermons and the discussion of preliminary matters, the hearing and dismissing the ambassadors of the Emperor. The more

March 26.

[m] John Gerson was born 14th Dec. 1363, of a family devoted to the Church. His three brothers were monks. He studied at Paris under Peter d'Ailly in 1392 or 1395, succeeded Peter d'Ailly as Chancellor of the University. He had been the delegate of the University to both Popes.—Dupin, Vita Gersoni.

[n] Gersoni Opera, ii. p. 114. His doctrine was this: "Unitas Ecclesiæ semper manet ad Christum sponsum suum.... Et si non habet vicarium, dum scilicet mortuus est corporaliter vel civiliter *vel quia non est probabiliter expectandum quod unquam sibi vel successoribus ejus obedientia præstetur a Christianis*, tunc Ecclesia, tam divino quam naturali jure, potest ad procurandum sibi vicarium *unum et certum* semet congregare ad Concilium Generale repræsentans eam, et hoc non solum, auctoritate Dominorum Cardinalium, sed etiam adjumento et auxilio cujuscunque Principis, vel alterius Christiani."

solemn business commenced with the arrival of the French and English ambassadors (France had at first been represented only by the Bishop of Meaux), Simon de Cramault Patriarch of Alexandria, Giles de Champs Bishop of Coutances, and two doctors, Robert Hallam Bishop of Salisbury, Henry Bishop of St. David's, the Prior of the Benedictines in Canterbury, Thomas Abbot of St. Mary Jervaulx, the Earl of Suffolk, and several doctors. They rode into Pisa with great pomp with two hundred horses in their train.[o]

One month had almost fully elapsed, when the Advocate Fiscal, the Secretary of the Council, read certain resolutions framed by the promoters of the cause: among these, that the Holy Council was canonically called and constituted by the two Colleges of Cardinals now blended into one; that to them it belonged to take cognisance of the two competitors for the Papacy. The Advocate read a long and elaborate report on the origin and progress of the Schism. He concluded with this proposition: "Seeing that the contending Prelates had been duly cited, and, not appearing, declared contumacious, they were deprived of their pontifical dignity, and their partisans of their honours, offices, and benefices; if they contravened this sentence of deposition, they might be punished and chastised by secular judges; all kings, princes, and persons of every rank or quality were absolved from their oaths, and released from allegiance to the two rival claimants of the Popedom."[p] The promoters demanded the hearing of witnesses to the facts deposed. The hearing of witnesses proceeded; but before many days the Council found that this hearing would draw out to an interminable length. They declared the main facts matters of public notoriety. All went on in slow form. One Prelate alone departed from the grave dignity of the assembly, the Bishop of Sisteron in Provence, an Arragonese, up to this time a strong partisan of Benedict XIII. In his sermon, on "Purge away your old leaven," he caused astonishment among the audience by asserting that they were no more Popes than his old shoes;

April 24.

Two Popes declared to be deposed.

[o] L'Enfant, p. 269.

[p] Concilia, sub ann.

he called them worse than Annas and Caiaphas, and compared them to the devils in hell.[q] First was pronounced the general subtraction of obedience from both Popes. On the 5th June, proclamation having been again made for their appearance and no answer heard, the gates of the Cathedral were thrown open, and the definitive sentence read by the Patriarch of Alexandria. "The Holy Universal Council, representing the Catholic Church of God, to whom belongs the judgement in this cause, assembled by the grace of the Holy Ghost in the Cathedral of Pisa, having duly heard the promoters of the cause for the extirpation of the detestable and inveterate Schism, the union and re-establishment of our Holy Mother Church, against Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, called by some Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., declares the crimes and excesses, adduced before the Council, to be true, and of public fame. The two competitors, Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, have been and are notorious schismatics, obstinate partisans, abettors, defenders, approvers of this long schism; notorious heretics as having departed from the faith; involved in the crimes of perjury and breach of their oaths; openly scandalising the Church by their manifest obstinacy, and utterly incorrigible; by their enormous iniquities and excesses they have made themselves unworthy of all honour and dignity, especially of the Supreme Pontificate; and though by the canons they are actually[r] rejected of God, deprived and cut off from the Church, nevertheless the Church, by this definitive sentence, deposes, rejects and cuts them off, prohibiting both and each from assuming any longer the Sovereign Pontificate, declaring for further security[s] the Papacy to be vacant." The rest of the sentence pronounced Christians of all ranks absolved from all vows and engagements towards them, uttered excommunication and other canonical penalties against all who should succour, abet, or harbour either of them. Whosoever should refuse obedience to this decree, the competitors or their abettors, were to be repressed by the

Sentence.

[q] L'Enfant, p. 273, from the Abbot of Saint Maixant.

[r] Ipso facto.

[s] Ad cautelam.

secular arm. All censures, excommunications, interdicts, issued by the two pretendants, were annulled; all promotions since May, 1408, declared void.[t]

Such was the first solemn, deliberate, authoritative act, by which a General Council assumed a power superior to the Papacy, which broke the long tradition of the indefeasible, irresponsible autocracy of the Pope throughout Christendom. It assumed a dictatorial right in a representative body of the Church to sit, as a judicial tribunal, with cognisance of the title by which Papal authority was exercised, of offences committed by Prelates claiming to be Popes, and to pronounce in the last instance on the validity of their acts. It was much beyond a decision on a contested election; it was the cashiering of both, and that not on account of irregularity or invalidity of title, but of crimes and excesses subject to ecclesiastical censure; it was a sentence of deposition and deprivation, not of uncanonical election. Each party of Cardinals had concurred in the election of one or other of the Popes; they could not take that ground without impugning their own authority. If the Schism imperceptibly undermined the Papal power in public estimation, the General Council might seem to shake it to its base.

The Council had a harder task than the deposal of the two contesting Popes, of whom Christendom was weary, and who were abandoned by most of their own partisans. The election of a new Pope, who should command universal respect, and awe back the world into its old reverence for the Supreme Pontiff, was the necessary but far more difficult function of the Council. The Conclave could not be charged with precipitation. During eleven days[u] the twenty-six Cardinals were occupied in their momentous consultation. The secrets of the Conclave were religiously kept. No one knew whether these days were occupied by grave and impartial deliberation or by the struggle of conflicting interests. The Cardinals must have gone beyond their own pale to have found a Prelate whose name for ability, learning, piety, would have extorted universal admiration. Most

Election of Pope.

[t] The decree may be read in à Niem, c. 44, L'Enfant, and the Concilia.
[u] From June 15 to June 26.

of them had been promoted during the Schism, as zealous partisans of either Pope, rather than as distinguished Churchmen. One alone, Balthasar Cossa, afterwards John XXIII., was known for his consummate power and energy, though certainly for no other hierarchical qualifications. But his time was not come. The warlike Legate, who had crushed the liberties of Bologna, had doubtless the sagacity not yet to aspire to the supreme dignity, probably had no chance of commanding the suffrages of the French Cardinals, to whom he was unknown, or the Italian, by whom he was too well known and feared.

The choice fell on Peter Philargi, of Candia, of the Order of Friar Minors, commonly called Cardinal of Milan, rightly Cardinal of the Twelve Apostles. This choice may have been the final determination to set up an irreproachable man, of some fame for eloquence and learning, or a compromise between the unyielding Cisalpine and Transalpine parties. Whenever such compromise takes place, it is usually in favour of an aged Prelate; and the Cardinal of Milan was above seventy years old. Alexander V. (the name he assumed) was of such obscure origin, that it is disputed whether the Candia from which he was named was the Island of Crete, or a small village in the Milanese. Cast parentless and friendless on the world, he had become a Mendicant Friar. Beggary was not his choice only, it was his lot. His life had been blameless, studious, holy. He had studied theology at Oxford and Paris; and had been raised by the discernment of Gian Galeazzo Visconti to the tutorship of his sons. By the same influence he became Bishop of Vicenza, of Novara, and Archbishop of Milan. Alexander V. was superior to the two vices which had loaded with reproach the fame and memory of most of his predecessors—avarice and nepotism. His weakness was prodigality. He lavished what under the existing circumstances must have been the limited and precarious resources of the Papacy with such generous profusion, that he said of himself, he had been rich as a Bishop, as a Cardinal poor, as Pope he was a beggar. On the day of his enthronement his grants were so lavish as to justify, if not to give rise to, the rumour, that the Cardinals, on entering

into the Conclave, had made a vow that whosoever should be elected would grant to the households of his brother Cardinals the utmost of their demands. From nepotism Alexander V. was safe, for he was without kindred or relatives. But there was another, perhaps more fatal, nepotism which turned the tide of popularity against him —the nepotism of his Order. It was more than the accumulation of all the offices of his Court on his beloved brethren, more than the lavish grant of bishopries and dignities—it was the undue elevation of the Franciscans[x] above all the Secular, all the Regular Clergy. Two hundred years had not allayed the strife of the Mendicants and the Clergy. From the highest seats of learning to the most obscure country parish, there was rivalry, strife, jealousy, hatred. Still the theory of the Church, her whole discipline, depended on the sole and exclusive authority of the lawful pastors in their parishes, and on their exclusive right to perform the services of the Church, to hear confession, to grant absolution. Some highminded and far-seeing among the Prelates or the Clergy might welcome the Friars as active and zealous coadjutors in the task of Christianising mankind; they might keep on terms of mutual respect and harmony. The Mendicants might even, by their noble exertions under terrible exigencies, as declared in the Consistory of Avignon after the great plague, command the unwilling approbation of Cardinals and Popes.[y] But in general they were still hated with unmitigated hatred by the Clergy: by some of the better, as unjustly interfering between them and their beloved flocks, and as alienating and seducing away their people's affections; by the worse, as a standing reproach on their negligence and ignorance, and as drawing off to themselves the emoluments which the Clergy deemed their sole right —the oblations, the gifts, the bequests. The inevitable degeneracy of the Friars would no doubt aggravate the strife. The Mendicant Orders had spread their net too

[x] "Aliquos etiam Fratres Minores sibi charos et sociales publicis officiis et lucrativis quæ prius consueverant regi per seculares personas habiles et expertos in eâdem suâ curiâ præfecit, et miro modo conabatur plerosque Fratres Minores Cathedralibus Ecclesiis præficere ut pastores."—A Niem, iii. c. 51.

[y] See vol. v. p. 546.

wide not to comprehend multitudes of men with no other qualification than beggary. So soon as they became, if not rich, with the advantages of riches, with splendid convents, ample endowments, or even the privilege of subsisting at the cost of others, they would become little better than what they had been long called by their adversaries in England—sturdy beggars. Up to this time the Popes (as has appeared in our history)[z] had left some restraint on the Friars. They were too useful partisans, too much under the Papal control, not to find as much favour as could be granted without absolutely estranging the Clergy; yet the Bishops retained some power over them; and the Popes had refused absolutely to abrogate the exclusive privileges of the secular clergy. The relations of the two rival bodies were still kept in a kind of politic balance, and rested on vague and contradictory decrees.

Bull of Alexander in favour of the Friars. Oct. 12.

The Bull of Alexander V., issued but a few months after his accession, rudely struck down the barrier.[a] It invested the Friar Preachers, the Friar Minors, the Augustinians, and the Carmelites, in the full, uncontrolled power of hearing confession and granting absolution in every part of Christendom. It rescinded, and declared null, if not heretical, seven propositions advanced or sanctioned by other Popes, chiefly John XXII. One of these it averred, with unnecessary insult and disparagement of the Papal infallibility, to have been issued by that Pope when under condemnation for heresy. These propositions had enacted that without the consent of the parish priest, or at least of the Bishop, no Friar could hear confession. This Bull was not only the absolute annihilation of the exclusive prerogatives and pretensions of the Clergy, but it was ordered to be read by the Clergy themselves in all the churches in Christendom. They were to publish before their own flocks the triumph of their enemies, the complete independence of their parishioners on their authority, their own condemnation for insufficiency, their disfranchisement from their ancient

[z] Compare vol. v. p. 52. L'Enfant has given the substance of the former Bulls, p. 309, &c.

[a] Relig. de St. Denys. Laboureur's translation of the Bull may be read in L'Enfant, p. 314.

immemorial rights. Henceforth there was a divided dominion in every diocese, in every parish there were two or more conflicting claimants on the obedience, the love, and the liberality of the flock. Still further, all who dared to maintain the propositions annulled by the Bull were to be proceeded against as contumacious and obstinate heretics. Thus the Pope, who was to reconcile and command or win distracted Christendom to peace and unity—a narrow-minded Friar, thinking only of his own Order—had flung a more fatal apple of discord into the world, and stirred up a new civil war among the more immediate adherents of the Papacy, among those who ought to have been knit together in more close and intimate confederacy.

University of Paris.

The reception of this Bull in Paris, though its injurious workings were more openly and indignantly resented in Paris than elsewhere, may show its effects throughout Christendom. The old war of the University with the Dominicans and Franciscans, which had ended in the humiliation of ~~their~~ champion William of St. Amour, and the triumphant participation by ~~their~~ intrusive rivals in ~~their~~ ancient privileges (perhaps not mitigated by the assumption of the mastery over her schools by the great Dominican and Franciscan teachers, Albert the Great, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus), was not beyond the scope of ~~their~~ recollection. The tradition of academic jealousy and rivalry is endowed with pertinacious vitality. They rose in almost unanimous insurrection. The University of Paris had hailed with acclamations the accession of Pope Alexander. No sooner had this Bull arrived in the city, than, with contemptuous doubts of its authenticity, they sent delegates to Pisa to inquire whether it was genuine. The delegates would not be satisfied without seeing the leaden seal attached to the Bull.[b] The Bull professed to have been framed with the advice and consent of the Cardinals; the delegates visited and inquired separately of the Cardinals whether they had given

[b] "A Pope's Bull and a Pope's Brief differ very much, as with us the great seal and the privy seal; the Bull being the highest authority the Pope can give, the Brief is of less. The Bull has a leaden seal upon silk, hanging upon the instrument; the Brief has *sub annulo Piscatoris* upon the side." I quote this from Selden's Table Talk, on account of the illustration.

such advice and consent, thus tacitly accusing the Pope of falsehood or forgery. The Cardinals disclaimed all participation in the decree; they did not deny that it was injurious to all who had the cure of souls.

The University, on the report of her delegates, proceeded to expel all Mendicant Friars from their walls, and to prohibit their preaching in Paris till they had produced and renounced the original Bull. The Preachers (Dominicans) and the Carmelites declared that they had no knowledge of the Bull, that they were content with the privileges possessed before the time of Alexander V. But the Franciscans, proud of a Pope from their own Order, went about defying all authority, and boasting that to them alone it belonged to preach, to hear confession, and even to levy tithes.[c] The King interposed; on their convent gates was affixed a royal proclamation, forbidding Priests and Curates to permit the Franciscans or Augustinians to preach or hear confession in their churches.[d] The Chancellor Gerson, the oracle of the Council, denounced the act of the Pope in no measured language.[e]

Whatever tended to destroy the popularity of Alexander threw discredit on the Council of Pisa. Murmurs were heard in many quarters that the Council, instead of extinguishing the Schism, had but added a third Pope. Benedict from his fastness at Peniscola issued his anathemas against the Council and against his rivals. Gregory had been obliged to take ignominious flight from the territories of Venice; he found refuge with Ladislaus. As the price of his security, and for 25,000

Gregory and Ladislaus in Rome.

[c] A Niem describes the joy of the Franciscans at the elevation of Alexander V.: "Mirabiliter lætificati sunt; discurrebant enim per vicos et plateas civitatis catervatim valde multi eorum per singulos dies, velut essent mente capti."—iii. c. 53.

[d] Relig. de St. Denys.

[e] Relig. de St. Denys. "Dedisti nobis unum et verum Ecclesiæ Pastorem, quem recepimus magno cum gaudio, reverentiâ et exultatione. Et ecce malignum spiritum prœlii et divisionis, qui visus est suscitare turbationem novam, malam nimis, nimis coopertam et fraudulentam sub umbrâ boni et religionis." The Christian hierarchy, writes Gerson, consists of the Pope, Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, successors of the Apostles; of curates, successors of the 70 disciples. Gerson asserts in the strongest terms the exclusive and perpetual rights of the curates to all the offices and emoluments of their function. They are more perfect than simple monks. "Sequitur statum curatorum perfectiorem esse statu simplicium religiosorum." This was new doctrine.—Gersoni Opera, ii. p. 433.

gold florins, he was reported at least to have sacrilegiously alienated the patrimony of the Church, to have sold Rome, the March, Bologna, Faenza, Forlì, and all the lands of St. Peter to that ambitious King. Ladislaus unfurled his standard, which bore the menacing inscription, "Cæsar or Nothing." He occupied Rome with a large force;[f] he had made terms with Paolo Orsini, the Guelfic condottiere; he was advancing on Tuscany. Alexander, Pope without a rood of the Papal dominions, fulminated his Bulls against the ally of the deposed Gregory, the usurper of the dominions of the See of Rome. But the Pope, recognised by France, and by most of the Italian States, had more formidable forces than spiritual censures. Louis of Anjou, in whom centered the hereditary pretensions of his house to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, appeared at Pisa with five hundred lances. Florence who feared and hated Ladislaus, and the Cardinal Legate with his bands at Bologna, formed with Louis a strong league. Their armament moved towards Rome; Paolo Orsini advanced against him.[g] But the religion and loyalty of the captain of a Free Company depended on the highest bidder. He had no scruples in changing his service and his Pope. He marched back with Louis of Anjou to reduce Rome, which he had gone forth to protect. At first the Leonine City, the Vatican, and St. Peter's, then the Castle of St. Angelo, at length the Cisteverine region and the Capitol submitted to the conqueror. Rome acknowledged Pope Alexander V. Oct. 1.

Alexander had been driven by the plague from Pisa to Prato; from Prato he removed to Pistoia.[h] Instead of

[f] The occupation of Rome by Ladislaus is afterwards described by Pope John XXIII. as "optentu nepharioatque velamine maledictionis filii Angeli Corarii, heretici et schismatici, per generale Pisan^m Concilium justo Dei judicio sententialiter condemnati."—MS. B. M. Oct. 23, 1411. There is in the Diary of Antonius Petri (Muratori, t. xxiv.) a very curious account of the transactions in Rome day by day, of the hangings and decapitations, daily occurrences, of many of which Antonius was eye-witness. But on great events he is provokingly silent. He gives this strange inscription on one of the banners of Ladislaus, which he unfurled with the Papal banner:—

Io son un povero Re, amico delle Saccomanni,
Amatore delle populi, e distruttore delle Tiranni.
p. 999.

[g] Antonius Petri describes the entrance of King Louis and the Orsinis, with the Cardinal S. Eustachio (Balthasar Cossa), into Rome, Oct. 1.

[h] The appointment of Marcello Strozzi Nuncio and Collector in England is dated Pistoia, 30th Dec. 1409.—MS. B. M.

taking possession of Rome he crossed the cold snowy Apennines to put himself under the protection, or to deliver himself into the hands, of the Cardinal Legate. In Bologna he died in peace after a Pontificate not much exceeding ten months. Rumours of course that he died by poison spread abroad, and his successor bore of course the guilt of his untimely end.[l]

May 3, 1410.

The Conclave had followed the Pope. After a very short interval it was announced to Christendom that twenty-four Cardinals had given their unanimous suffrages;[k] that Balthasar Cossa was chosen Supreme Pontiff, and had taken the name of John XXIII.[m]

Sunday, May 25, 1410.

John XXIII. is another of those Popes the record of whose life, by its contradictions, moral anomalies, almost impossibilities, perplexes and baffles the just and candid historian. That such, even in those times, should be the life even of an Italian Churchman, and that after such life he should ascend to the Papacy, shocks belief; yet the record of that life not merely rests on the concurrent testimony of all the historians of the time, two of them secretaries to the Roman Court, but is avouched by the deliberate sanction of the Council of Constance to articles which, as will hereafter appear, contained all the darkest charges of the historians, and to some of which John himself had pleaded guilty.

John XXIII.

Balthasar Cossa was a Neapolitan of noble birth;[n] as a simple clerk he served in the piratical warfare carried on by the hostile fleets of the rival Provençal and Hungarian Kings of Naples. He retained through life

His youth.

[l] "Idem dominus Alexander Papa in lecto ægritudinis constitutus Bononiæ coram suis Cardinalibus pulchrum sermonem Latinum fecit." He died four days after, May 3, 1410. In the Chronicon attributed to à Niem is the text of this sermon, "Pacem meam do vobis, pacem reliuquo vobis."—Apud Eccard, p. 1536. S. Antoninus, Chronic., ii. Dugloss, Hist. Polon., attributes his death to a poisoned clyster. Monstrelet speaks more generally of poison. The sixth article against John XXIII. at Constance accuses John, and his physician, Daniel de S. Sophia, of the crime.—Ap. Von. de Hardt. iv. 1, 3. But see in Monstrelet the pompous funeral.

[k] The list in Ciacconius, p. 786. It was not certain how many were actually present at the election.

[m] Read in Monstrelet the account of his election and splendid inauguration, l. i. c. lxviii.

[n] De Vitâ Joannis XXIII., à Theodoric à Niem, apud Meibomium, i. This work must be compared with the charges entertained and confirmed by the Council of Constance, and at length admitted by John himself.

the pirates' habit of sleeping by day, and waking by night. At a later period two of his brothers, who had not like himself abandoned in time that perilous vocation, were taken by King Ladislaus, and notwithstanding the influence of Balthasar with the Pope, and the Pope's strenuous exertions in their behalf, hanged without mercy. Balthasar cherished from that time an implacable hatred to Ladislaus. He retired to Bologna and studied the Canon Law, it was said without much success. He was raised by Boniface IX. to the dignity of Archdeacon of Bologna. But his ambition had higher views. He returned to Rome, and was appointed one of the Pope's chamberlains.° He became one of the dexterous and unscrupulous agents of the Pope's insatiable avarice and of his own. He was the most daring and skilful vendor of preferments, the most artful of usurers. By secret, and as they demeaned themselves to their victims, friendly messengers, he warned rich Prelates, that the Pope, ill-disposed towards them, designed to remove them from their wealthy and peaceful benefices to preferments in barbarous countries, in remote islands, or lands held by the Saracens. He received vast bribes to propitiate the unfriendly Pontiff. To him was attributed the enormous abuse of Indulgences. Already Priests and Friars, loaded with these lucrative commodities, travelled through Germany, by Thuringia, Swabia, Saxony, into the Northern kingdoms, Denmark and Sweden. On their arrival in a city they exhibited a banner with the Papal arms, the keys of St. Peter, from the windows of their inn. They entered the principal church, took their seat before the altar, the floor strewed with rich carpets, and, under awnings of silk to keep off the flies, exhibited to the wondering people, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Priests or Bishops, their precious wares. "I have heard them," writes the biographer of John XXIII., "declare that St. Peter himself had not greater power to remit sins than themselves." One of the wealthiest of these Papal merchants, on his return from his journey, was seized at Bologna. Balthasar Cossa, perhaps his former patron,

° Cubicularius.

but now Legate, plundered him of 100,000 florins. The poor victim hanged himself in prison.[p]

Legate in Bologna.

Pope Boniface had formed so high an estimate of the abilities of Balthasar Cossa, that he was raised to the Cardinalate, and appointed Legate to wrest the city of Bologna from the domination of the Visconti.[q] The Legate fulfilled his mission; the poor student of law, the Archdeacon of Bologna, became the lord of that city with as absolute and unlimited dominion as the tyrant of any other of the Lombard or Romagnese commonwealths. Balthasar Cossa, if hardly surpassed in extortion and cruelty by the famous Eccelino, by his debaucheries might have put to shame the most shameless of the Viscontis. Under his iron rule day after day such multitudes of persons of both sexes, strangers as well as Bolognese, were put to death on charges of treason, sedition, or other crimes, that the population of Bologna seemed dwindling down to that of a small city. He used to send to the executioners to despatch their victims with greater celerity. Neither person nor possession was exempt from his remorseless taxation. Grain could not be ground, nor bread made, nor wine sold without his licence. From all ranks, from the noble to the peasant, he exacted the most laborious services. He laid taxes on prostitutes, gaming-houses, usurers. His licentiousness was even more wide and promiscuous. Two hundred maids, wives, and widows, with many nuns, are set down as victims of his lust. Many were put to death by their jealous and indignant husbands and kindred. The historian wonders that in so rich and populous a city no husband's, or father's, or brother's dagger found its way to the heart of the tyrant.[r]

So is Balthasar Cossa described by Theodoric à Niem,

[p] A Niem, p. 7.

[q] There was another notorious, it was said, but unavowed reason for his foreign mission, his separation from his brother's wife, the sister of a Cardinal, with whom he was living in incestuous and, even for Rome, scandalous concubinage.

[r] Yet the Chronicle, or rather the Continuation attributed to à Niem, speaks thus of his nearly nine years' administration of Bologna: "Floruit multum civitas et adaucta est longâ pace." But the author, who passes over Cossa's early life, admits that before the Council of Constance above forty charges were proved, some against his life, some against his doctrine; and that John XXIII. admitted their truth.—Apud Eccard, p. 1537.

his secretary. Leonardo Aretino, another secretary, in pregnant and significant words, represents him as a great man, of consummate ability in worldly affairs, nothing or worse than nothing in spiritual.

At the death of Alexander V. the Conclave, of sixteen Cardinals at least,[s] in Bologna, were entirely in the power of this ambitious and unscrupulous man. They may have discarded the suspicions awakened by the opportune death of Alexander, though, as has been said, among the crimes afterwards not only murmured in secret, but alleged against John XXIII., was that of having poisoned his predecessor; no man whose death was important could be suffered to die in the course of nature.

The election, though without actual violence, may have been compulsory; yet at Constance, though almost all the Cardinals bear testimony against John, this does not seem to have been among the charges.[t] But the awe, the terror of his character and of their perilous situation may not have been less real. They may have wilfully closed their eyes (dastardly or almost impossible as it may seem) against his crimes and vices, allowing themselves to be dazzled by his higher qualities, his energy, courage, military skill, success. He was the Pope to restore the Papal interests in Romagna, in Italy, in Christendom. Already Cardinal Cossa had won back Rome to the dominion of his predecessor. He had his own powerful forces; he had bought over Paolo Orsini; with his close confederate, Louis of Anjou, he had made Ladislaus of Naples tremble on his throne. The ambassadors of Louis were in Bologna, strongly urging the election of their King's useful, indispensable ally.

No wonder if the secrets of that Conclave were betrayed; it is still less wonderful that the accounts are contradictory; none would wish, none would dare to speak the truth. Each as his own exculpation might require, or his hatred predominate, would colour the facts. Cossa, it is said, appalled the Conclave with his threats; he scornfully

[s] The number present varies. See above.

[t] This charge had been a condemnation of their own weakness and want of Christian courage.

rejected each name proposed; in their fear and discord they left him to name the Pope. He demanded the stole of St. Peter to array the worthiest, put it on his own shoulders—I am Pope.[u] By another account he proposed the Cardinal Caracciolo, an unlearned, rude, and most unfit man. On his rejection Cossa himself was chosen.[x] The same writer in another place speaks of unmeasured bribery. Perhaps the simple phrase of a third may be most true—he owed his election to the troops at his command.[y] But whatever their motives, fear, deception, corruption, foreign influence—whether affrighted, cajoled, bribed, dazzled—the Conclave refused to remember the enormities of the life of Balthasar Cossa; the pirate, tyrant, adulterer, violator of nuns, became the successor of St. Peter, the Vicegerent of Christ upon earth.[z] Cossa was Pope; Louis of Anjou hastened to kiss the feet of his brother-in-arms; fourteen ecclesiastics, some of the wisest and ablest Prelates of Italy, accepted the title and rank of Cardinal at his hands. He fulminated his sentence of excommunication against the deprived Antipopes Gregory and Benedict; against King Ladislaus, whom he deposed from his throne.

Battle of Rocca Secca. May 17, 1411.

At first the united forces of the Pope and Louis of Anjou met with some reverses; but during the next year, at the battle of Rocca Secca, Ladislaus suffered a total defeat. But Louis of Anjou, with his French impetuosity, knew not how to profit by it. "On the first day," said Ladislaus, "my person and my realm were at the mercy of the enemy; on the second my person was safe, but my realm was lost; on the third hope arose for my realm as well as my person."[a] Pope John had already advanced to Rome. No sooner had he left Bologna than the whole city rose with cries of Long live the people! Long live the Arts![b] The Cardinal Legate fled to the

[u] Philip of Bergamo. Supplem. Chronic. L'Enfant, ii. p. 4.

[x] Theodoric à Niem, Vit. Johan. XXIII. In his Invectiva, à Niem accuses Cossa of having broken up the threshold with a golden axe, and given a sop to the Molossian hounds.

[y] Platina.

[z] "In cujus electione multi scandalizati sunt, quia ut tyrannus rexisse Bononiam, et vitæ mundanæ deditus dicebatur."—Gobelinus, p. 330. This is at the least less passionate authority.

[a] S. Antoninus, p. 156.

[b] The guilds of the city.

citadel, from whence he looked down on the plunder of the palace; in a few days he was compelled to surrender at discretion. The Pope at Rome received, with exultation the tidings of the battle of Rocca Secca. The standards of the vanquished Ladislaus were dragged ignominiously through the miry streets. But the triumph was short; Louis had in vain attempted to force the passes which led into the kingdom of Naples; he returned baffled and discomfited to Rome, and after a few weeks embarked for Provence. July 12. Aug. 3.

The Pope was left alone to the vengeance of Ladislaus. Florence had abandoned the League; he renewed his idle maledictions against a King who laughed them to scorn. He published a Crusade throughout Christendom, in Italy, France, Germany, England,[c] Denmark, Norway, Prussia, Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, even in Cyprus and the East.[d] He summoned and held a Council at Rome, but few prelates would venture their lives in the unapproachable and insecure city. The Council was only memorable for an incident, in itself ludicrous, which nevertheless struck deep fear into many hearts as a dismal omen. Immediately after the opening Mass for the descent of the Holy Spirit a huge owl flew out, screeching and fixing its eyes on the Pope. Those who dared to laugh laughed; some whispered, "A strange shape for the Holy Ghost!" The Pope broke up the assembly. On the next day there sat the owl, with its large eyes full on the Pope. The Cardinals with difficulty drove it out with sticks and stones.[e] These Papal acts, the excommunication and the Crusade, which displayed the dauntlessness and energy of the Pope, had been but feeble security against the King of Naples at his gates, if the crafty Ladislaus had not found it his in- Pope submits to Ladislaus.

[c] MS. B. M. Not merely was the Crusade to be preached, with all the privileges of a Crusade to the Holy Land, but a subsidy implored, and a tenth demanded of the clergy, by the Legates, Antonio da Pineto, General of the Minorites, and Paul da Sulmone, Archdeacon of Ravenna. Oct. 23, 1411. The Legates had power to absolve fifty persons excommunicated for trading with Alexandria in Egypt, and all the other ordinary powers. He hoped to make an agreement with Thomas of Lancaster, the King's second son, to head an English crusade. Nov. 9, 1411.

[d] The preaching of this Crusade and the Indulgences in Bohemia was a great cause of the Hussite disturbances.

[e] See Clemangis, Tract, p. 75, from an eye-witness. A Niem, apud Von der Hardt, ii. 375.

terest to incline to peace. King and Pope had too many enemies, too few, and those but hollow friends. The Pope would purchase, at the highest price, not only peace but the recognition of his title.[f] Pope Gregory still lived under the protection of the King, in undisturbed retirement at Gaeta. Ladislaus was seized with qualms of religious conscience. He summoned the Prelates and theologians of his realm, and imparted to them his grave doubts, whether he were not guilty of sin in maintaining a Pope rejected by all Christendom. He paid a cold civil visit to express his profound respect and sorrow to him whom he had so long honoured as Pope. Gregory had no ungrounded apprehensions lest he might be surrendered to his rival. Two Venetian merchant-ships were in the harbour; the inhabitants of Gaeta loved the poor old Pope; they bought a passage for him and his Court. The vessels sailed all round Calabria, and though pursued by the galleys of John XXIII. reached Rimini. Gregory was received by the Malatestas, the deadly enemies of Pope John.[g]

Ladislaus dictated the terms of the treaty with the Pope; at least no Pope not under hard necessity had submitted to such terms. Ladislaus was acknowledged not only as king of Naples, but also as King of Sicily. The Arragonese King of Sicily adhered to Benedict XIII. Ladislaus was named Gonfalonier of the Church. The Pope consented to pay 120,000 florins of gold; he surrendered as security the cities of Ascoli, Viterbo, Perugia, and Benevento. He absolved Ladislaus from a debt of 40,000 florins, the accumulated tribute to the Papacy. The Pope was to maintain 1000 horse for the subjugation of Sicily. The Pope obtained at this vast and dishonourable sacrifice only peace and the recognition of his own title; the dismissal not the surrender of the rival Pope.[h]

Oct. 1412.

Yet this peace did not last many months. The Pope

[f] A Niem had heard from a partisan of Gregory XII. that John XXIII. paid, and that Ladislaus received by the hands of a certain Florentine, 100,000 florins for his abandonment of Gregory. —p. 17.

[g] Raynald. sub ann.

[h] A Niem, p. 16.

had but time to exasperate Rome with his exactions. Though, as it should seem, himself possessed of great resources, he determined that Rome should pay for her own security. His prothonotaries and referendaries wrung subsidies from the Cardinals and the Clergy; the Senators from the people. A heavy duty on wine drove the populace to fury. The measure of wine usually sold at one florin rose to nine. He taxed the artisans and shopkeepers, and issued a debased coinage. The Pope was compelled to post up the abolition of the obnoxious wine duty on all the corners of the streets.

New quarrel with Ladislaus.

The causes of the breach with the King of Naples are obscure, if any cause was wanting beyond the treachery and ambition of the King, the utter insincerity and avarice of the Pope. John hoped to reap a rich harvest by deposing all the Bishops and rich beneficiaries of the Kingdom of Naples who had sworn allegiance to Gregory, or by extorting heavy mulcts for their confirmation. The wines of Naples were loaded with a prohibitory duty. Ladislaus had already troops moving in the March of Ancona, urging the cities to revolt; rumours spread of his designs on Rome; his troops were at the gates, within the city. The Romans swore that they would eat their children rather than submit to the dominion of that dragon Ladislaus.[i] The Pope went through the solemn mockery of committing the defence of the city to the patriotic heroism of the citizens; he himself fled in haste first to Sutri, then to Viterbo, then to Montefiascone. The Cardinals and the Court followed as they might; some fell into the hands of the relentless enemy. The city, perhaps in secret intelligence with Ladislaus, made no resistance.[k] The Neapolitan

A.D. 1413.

Pope leaves Rome. June 5. June 7.

[i] "Nos Romani primò volumus comedere filios nostros antequam volumus habere dominium istius Draconis."—Antonius Petri.

[k] According to à Niem, who describes the rupture, John XXIII. did not fly till the soldiers of Ladislaus were in the city. The Pope showed equal want of courage and ability.—p. 21. The city was weary of the taxation of the Pope. Ladislaus had many of the Romans in his pay. "Aliqui etiam eorundem Romanorum secretè partem dicti regis tenuerunt, stipendiati per ipsum *more veteri Romanorum*." A Niem fled with him. He was in Rome, March 1413. Ladislaus encamped in the Roman Campagna the beginning of May; the Pope fled in June. He was in Florence Oct. 7 to the beginning of November. He was at Bologna Nov. 12; in the end of that month in Lombardy. He returned to Bologna about Easter in the ensuing year.

soldiers plundered all the palaces of the Pope and Cardinals, and did not even spare the sacred buildings; they stabled their horses in the churches. They pillaged all the wealthy clergy; some lost their lives. The Pope fled by Sienna to Florence, which opened her hospitable gates to receive him, more from jealousy or dread of Ladislaus, than from respect for the Pontiff. Ladislaus had summoned Sutri, Viterbo, Montefiascone to surrender him. From Florence he withdrew to Bologna, now again submitted to the Papal rule.

In John XXIII. it might almost seem that the weight of his vices had crushed the stronger faculties of his mind. This consummate master of Italian craft had been overreached, baffled, put to shame, driven from Rome, by the superior treachery as well as the superior force of Ladislaus. He was now betrayed into a step more fatal to his power, his fame, his memory, by the overbearing energy and resolution, if it may be so said, the single-minded cunning, of Sigismund, Emperor of Germany. The Council of Constance, from which John XXIII. hoped to emerge the undisputed Vicar of Christ, the one all-honoured Pope, cast him out as a condemned, degraded, unpitied captive, even more utterly forsaken, scorned, and down-trodden than his two old rivals, deposed by the Council of Pisa.

The Emperor Sigismund.

Yet it was hard necessity which drove Pope John into close alliance with the Emperor Sigismund; and the character of Sigismund had not yet disclosed its obstinate firmness and determination to enforce submission even from Popes to the deliberate desires of Christendom. He might, as far as had yet appeared, be overawed by the vigour, or circumvented by the astuteness, of a subtle Italian. At all events Sigismund was now the only safeguard against the irresistible Ladislaus. Already the Neapolitan troops had possession of the Roman territory as far as Sienna. Bologna, if strong in her citadel, disaffected in her city, might at any time be besieged. Sigismund might be expected to cherish profound revenge against Ladislaus for his attempt on the kingdom of Hungary.

Sigismund was now sole and uncontested Emperor. The schism in the empire had been extinguished, first by the death of the Emperor Rupert, then by that of Jodoc of Moravia, the competitor of Sigismund.[m] He was the most powerful Emperor who for many years had worn the crown of Germany, and the one unoccupied sovereign in Europe. France and England were involved in ruinous war. Henry V., by the battle of Agincourt, had hopes of the conquest at least of half France. France, depressed by the melancholy lunacy of the King, by the long implacable feuds of the Armagnacs and Burgundians, by the English victories, had sunk far below her usual station in Christendom. Sigismund, as Emperor, had redeemed the follies, vices, tyrannies of his youth. During that youth, as Margrave of Brandenburg, his wasteful prodigality had compelled him to pawn his Margravate; he had lost the kingdom of Poland by his harsh despotism; at times passionately cruel, at times passionately merciful, his revenge on his enemies had no appearance of justice, his mercy no magnanimity. He had endangered his rightful kingdom of Hungary, by provoking the fiery Magyars to rebellion. He had attempted wrongfully to expel his brother from the kingdom of Bohemia. His immoderate love of women shocked an age accustomed to royal license. As Emperor he seemed almost at once transformed into the greatest sovereign whom the famous house of Luxemburg had ever offered to wear the Imperial crown. On his accession Sigismund declared that he should devote himself to the welfare of his subjects, as well in his own dominions as in the Empire. His conduct justified his declaration. He enacted and put in execution wise laws. He made peace by just mediation between the conflicting principalities. He was averse to war, but not from timidity. His stately person, his knightly manners, his accomplishments, his activity which bordered on restlessness, his magnificence, which struggled, sometimes to his humiliation, with his scanty means, had cast an unwonted and imposing

[m] Ashbach, Kaiser Sigmund, gives a full and good view of all these revolutions.

grandeur, which might recall the great days of the Othos, the Henrys, the Fredericks, around the Imperial throne.

But nothing so raised and confirmed the influence of Sigismund, as his avowed and stedfast resolution to terminate the Schism in the Church, and to compel the reformation of the clergy so imperiously demanded by all Christendom. This could be accomplished only by a General Council, a council of greater authority and more fully representing all the kingdoms and the whole hierarchy of Christendom than that of Pisa.

John XXIII. could not but know that the price of the alliance of Sigismund, now his only refuge, was the summoning a General Council. His own title rested on the authority of that of Pisa. The Council of Pisa had decreed that the same or another Council should meet after three years. If such Council were but a continuation of that of Pisa, he was the only Pope whom it could recognise; if summoned in his name, its obedience to that summons was an acknowledgment of his lawful authority. However dangerous so grave and solemn an assembly to a Pope whose election was by no means absolutely above the suspicion of force, bribery, or treachery; still more to a Pope burthened by the consciousness of a life so utterly unpapal: yet his confidence in his own subtlety and skill in intrigue; the authority of his position as actual and acknowledged Pontiff; the strong Italian interest which would rally round an Italian Pope; the great wealth, however obtained, at his command; the gratitude, if such virtue were known, of many Cardinals of high name for learning and virtue, whom he had promoted to that dignity; his power of impeding, protracting, postponing, perplexing, averting embarrassing questions; his personal presidency; a thousand fortuitous circumstances might mitigate the unavoidable danger, and enable him to involve in inextricable disputes a divided assembly: and what Council was ever without such divisions?

The Pope consents to the Council.

The Pope therefore determined to submit with a good grace to the inevitable Council. His ambassadors to the Emperor had full power to cede this

momentous point."[n] To his secretary, Leonardo Aretino, he betrayed his secret policy. "All depends on the place appointed for the Council: I will not trust myself within the dominions of the Emperor. My ambassadors, for the sake of appearances, shall have liberal instructions, and the fullest powers to display in public: in private I will limit them to certain cities."[o] These cities he named, and adhered for some days to his resolution. But on the day on which those ambassadors, the Cardinal Challant, and Zabarella Cardinal of Florence, took leave, he seemed seized with a sudden access of courage and confidence. He had intended to restrict their powers, yet he had such reliance on their discretion, that he tore in pieces their secret instructions and threw them aside.

The interview between the Emperor and the Cardinals took place at Como. Whether the Cardinals deliberately preferred the interests of Christendom to the interests of the Pope, or were overawed or persuaded by the Emperor, the Pope was thunderstruck when he heard that in his name they had agreed on Constance, an Imperial city on the German side of the Alps.

Constance, but that it was an Imperial city, was admirably adapted for the seat of a Council—at the foot of the Alps, accessible from Italy and from all parts of the world, with its spacious lake, from whose shores provisions might be furnished, with a salubrious air, and a well-ordered population. The Pope was perplexed to find ostensible objections; his true ones he dared not avow. He had recourse to a personal conference with the Emperor, to try how far, by his blandishments or subtle arguments, he might move the stubborn German. They met at Lodi, with ostentatious display of mutual respect. The Pope celebrated Mass in his most magnificent attire; the Emperor condescended to officiate as deacon. But if the Emperor took the lower office in ecclesiastical rank, he

[n] See summons to Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin to the Council. Pope John carefully asserts the *Presidency* of Alexander V. in the Council of Pisa. The Council of Rome, he acknowledged, was too thinly attended. The place of the Council was not named. MS. B. M., March 3, 1413. In another document it is said, "in loco decenti et ydoneo." Rome, May 15.

[o] Leonard. Aretin. apud Muratori, S. R. I. Raynald. sub ann. 1413.

made the Pope feel his superior moral dignity. He gravely admonished the Pope to amend his own irregular life, to correct the notorious simony of his court. The Pope was too politic to take offence. The Emperor and the Pontiff went together in seeming amity to Cremona. There an incident had nearly taken place, which, by preventing the Council of Constance, might have changed the fortunes of the world. Gabrino Fondoli from Podestâ had become tyrant of Cremona. He entertained his distinguished guests with sumptuous hospitality. He led them up a lofty tower to survey the rich and spacious plains of Lombardy. On his deathbed Fondoli confessed the sin of which he deeply repented, that he resisted the temptation, and had not hurled Pope and Emperor down, and so secured himself an immortal name.[p]

Nov. 1413.

The irrevocable step was now taken: John had wasted his arts, his eloquence, on the impassive Sigismund. The Imperial letters and the Papal Bull were almost simultaneously issued to summon the General Council of Christendom to meet at Constance towards the close of the ensuing year. The Imperial edict addressed to all Christendom cited all whom it might concern to the Council at Constance. Sigismund declared his own intention to be present; he guaranteed his full protection as Emperor, to all who should attend the Council. To the Pope and to the Cardinals he guaranteed all their ecclesiastical privileges, their immunities to all prelates and clerks, to the Pope his plenary authority, jurisdiction, and power. At the same time he summoned Gregory XII., not as by name Pope, under the assurance of a full safe conduct. Benedict XIII. was summoned through the King of Arragon.[q]

The Pope having passed some months at Mantua, under the protection of the Marquis Gonzaga, withdrew to Bologna. He had not calculated on his unlooked-for deliverance from his most dangerous and

About Easter, 1414.

[p] Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1413, with his authorities.

[q] Cæsar. Sigismund. Edictum Universale, Von der Hardt, vi. p. 5, *et seqq.* Raynald. sub ann. 1413. L'Enfant, 191. It is dated Oct. 30. The Pope's Brief, Dec. 1413.

implacable foe. Ladislaus of Naples was master of Romagna almost to the gates of Bologna, and Bologna was awaiting every month an attack from his irresistible arms. He had compelled a hollow, unwilling treaty with Florence. But Ladislaus was suddenly seized at Perugia with a mortal malady, the effect of his immoderate debaucheries. He was conveyed in a litter to Rome, thence by sea to Naples, and died.[r] Death of Ladislaus. Aug. 6, 1414.

The Pope might breathe freely. He had time, short time indeed, to repent of the haste and precipitancy with which he had committed himself (was he irretrievably committed?) to the dangerous, if not fatal Council. His kindred gathered round him, the friends of his power and fortune, if not of his person. They urged the grave, ominous admonition, "You may set forth as Pope to the Council, return a private man." But the Cardinals—and it is among the inexplicable problems of his life, that some of the Cardinals whom he promoted were men of profound piety, as well as learning and character—if less true to his interests, were more faithful to his honour and truth. They pressed on him, that he was solemnly pledged to the Emperor—to Christendom: there was no retreat. Their urgency might seem a guarantee for their loyalty.[s] If they counselled his departure, they were under a strong obligation to adhere to his cause: they could not in honour, or in regard to Italian interests, forsake him. In all councils, according to the ordinary form of suffrage, the Pope and the Cardinals had maintained commanding authority. So with heavy heart, with dark and ominous misgivings, but, on the other hand, in impressive pomp and with a treasure of vast magnitude, hoarded for this end, a treasure in itself the best security for the fidelity of his adherents, John XXIII. set forth from the gates of Bologna to open the Council of Constance. Oct. 1, 1414.

[r] Antonius Petri (p. 1045) of the death of Ladislaus: "De quâ novâ tota Roma videlicet pro majori parte gavisa est." Afterwards: "Obiit de unâ morte in litore maris dominus Rex Venceslaus, cujus anima *benedicatur per contrarium*" —a delicate phrase for damnation— "quia multa mala operatus fuit in hoc mundo, specialiter in totâ Româ, ac etiam in Ecclesia Urbis, videlicet in Ecclesiâ S. Petri et ejus Burgo, ut apparet." Neither party respected the churches. Orsini's troops with their horses were stabled in S. Paolo fuori delle mura.

[s] Raynaldus et Bzovius, sub ann. 1414.

CHAPTER VI.

WYCLIFFE.

During the secession of the Popes for seventy years to Avignon, and the Schism which ensued on their return to Italy, not only grew up the strong league of the hierarchy against the autocracy of the Pope, which had already in the Council of Pisa asserted, and in that of Constance was about to assume, a power superior to the Supreme Pontiff, with the right of deposing him, and reforming the Church in its Head as well as its members: in England also had appeared the first powerful adversary of the whole hierarchical system, and sowed deep in the popular mind thoughts, opinions, passions, which eventually led to the emancipation of mankind from sacerdotal and from Latin Christianity. The first teacher who shook with any lasting effect the dominion of the hierarchy—the harbinger, at least, if not the first apostle of Teutonic Christianity—was John Wycliffe.

Teutonic England.

The Teutonic constitution of England had slowly and steadily developed itself, encroaching at once on the Norman despotism of the Crown, and the Latin despotism of the Church. The privileges of the Clergy had fallen away, had been annulled, or sunk into desuetude, without resistance, with sullen but unregarded remonstrance.

Immunity of Clergy from civil courts.

The immunity of the whole order from the civil courts, and from the royal jurisdiction—their absolute right of being judged in all causes and for all crimes in the first instance, and therefore exclusively, in their own courts—that immunity for which Becket had begun his quarrel, lived in exile and died a martyr—had been abandoned in its extreme extent, or surrendered with no violent struggle. The strong hand of the law would no longer scruple to arrest and put on

his trial a priest accused of treason, murder, or other felony. Some sanctity still adhered to his person; but his property was confiscated to the Crown, though himself might be delivered up to the Ordinary. The singular plea, the Benefit of Clergy, lingered till recent times in our law, a feeble memorial of the times when no one dared lay unconsecrated hands on the "anointed of the Lord."[a] But even archbishops appear before long in rude but vain encounter with the civil courts, in exile without public sympathy, one laying his head on the block for treason.[b]

Immunity from taxation.

The second absolute immunity, from taxation, had been wrested from the Clergy, notwithstanding the obstinate and passionate resistance of Boniface VIII., by the vigour of Edward I. The Clergy who would not respect the king's law, being put out of the protection of the law, had found their old defence against the Crown, spiritual censures, so unavailing; the superstitious terror, or the grateful reverence of the people, so utterly gone; that they were compelled to yield.[c] They now hardly asserted more than their right to tax themselves for secular purposes in their separate House of Parliament, the Convocation, and to grant, assess, and levy the subsidies which they dared no longer to refuse.

Edward II.

Under the reign of the feeble Edward II. there is some resumption of the Papal power. We have heard Clement V. command the arrestation and persecution of the Templars: he was obeyed not without some

[a] See b. xii. c. viii.

[b] There is in Wilkins a curious instrument of Archbishop Langham (Primate, 1367). He complained in Parliament that the civil authorities had not scrupled to arrest, indict, even to condemn to public execution (morti turpissimæ et insolitæ condempnare), clerks and regulars in holy orders. The King and the magistrates, on the other side, complained that when such persons, so found guilty of the most flagitious crimes (such cases seem to have been very common), were given up on demand to their Bishops, they were negligently guarded, and so pampered in prison, that it was a place of comfort and enjoyment rather than of penance (quod carcer pro eorum flagitio non cedit ad pœnam, sed magis ad solatium et refocillationem suorum corporum). Some were allowed to escape, some discharged on slight evidence. They returned to their old courses, and were of bad example to unoffending clergymen. The Primate orders that the prisons be kept more strictly; these notorious malefactors and felons watched more closely and kept to hard diet.—Wilkins, iii. pp. 13, 14. In another document it is complained that priests and secular clerks are persons "pendus par agard des justices seculiers, en prejudice des franchises." King and Parliament grant benefit of clergy. In another, many clerks are found guilty of forging the King's coin.—P. 28.

[c] See vol. v. p. 191.

reluctance, but obeyed. The avaricious John XXII. would not abandon the claims of the See of Rome on the yet wealthy, not yet exhausted land. The mediation of Pope John between England and Scotland was accepted with the eager willingness of conscious weakness by Edward II., in his conscious strength sullenly, coldly submitted to by Robert Bruce.[d] Bruce laughed to scorn the Pope's excommunication.[e] But Pope John would not espouse the cause of England without his reward. He peremptorily demanded the full arrears of the tribute of 1000 marks, fallen behind under Edward I.; still more under Edward II., whose poverty, not his courage, resisted the Papal requisitions. The Pope recites the surrender of the island by King John. King Edward is admonished that the neglect is offensive to God, that on this payment depends his salvation.[f] In a letter to the Primate all the disasters of the land are traced to the sacrilegious withholding of the 1000 marks.[g] The Pope indeed gave good counsel to the young king.[h] He took his part, even by excommunication and interdict against the Barons, but at the same time warned him against his foolish and criminal favouritism.[i] Throughout the frequent correspondence appears the shrewd worldly wisdom of Pope John, too sagacious not to see and despise the weakness of the King; yet John is on the King's side, in order to secure the tribute of the land, the Peter's Pence, and other convenient emoluments of the See of Rome. He does not refuse to the King grants of subsidies from Church property.[k]

[d] See the apology of Pope John to Edward for addressing Robert Bruce by the title of King, without which Bruce would not receive his letters.—MS. B. M. Oct. 21, 1316; March 29, 1317.

[e] The Pope's Nuncios were waylaid and plundered near Durham by partisans of Bruce. The monks of Durham were concerned in this. It is a curious passage.—MS. B. M., vol. xvi., dated Avignon, April 28.

[f] "Et quorum præstatio divinam tibi gratiam poterit sequestrare."—Ad Reg. Edward, Sept. 18, 1317.

[g] Ad Episcop. Cantuaren.

[h] See the curious letter of advice, "cum juvenibus et imprudentibus tractas negotia ac consilium maturitatis abjiciens per viam Roboam, consilia (o?) juvenum incedis. Totius bona regni tui immoderatè distribuis."—Oct. 21, 1317. Compare p. 510: "Bona tua a garsionibus et gulosis hominibus aut aliis personis turpibus consumi contingunt."

[i] In 1322, Jan. 19, he exhorts Edward to peace with the Barons: he had not kept faith as to the sentence against the Despencers.—P. 431.

[k] There is one strange story, characteristic of the times and the men. Edward II., besides his ambassador, the Bishop of Hereford, sent a Franciscan friar to communicate most privately to the Pope ("nobis solis," writes John)

The wars of England and France under Edward III. had found the Pope no longer, even in theory, as of old, the impartial and independent Pontiff of Christendom, residing in his own capital, lord of his own territory, usually an Italian and chosen by Italian Cardinals. He was now a Frenchman, elected by a French Conclave, almost nominated by the King of France; if not within the realm, in a city on the borders of, and surrounded by France; a vassal, in truth, and often an instrument in the hands of that King. The Pope had indeed appeared to assume a lofty neutrality, had pretended to impose his imperious mediation; and the weaker the King of France had become by his humiliating defeats, the less servile became the Pope. Yet this neutrality, though not violated, was held in just suspicion by England; the mediation was hardly so far respected as to be declined. The conqueror of Crecy and of Poitiers was not likely to submit to the arbitration of a French Pope. More than once, it has been seen, the victorious bands of the Black Prince approached, alarmed, if they did not threaten, Avignon. The splendid palaces of the Cardinals at Villeneuve, on the right bank of the Rhone, might at any time fall a defenceless prey to the Gascon marauders.

a divine vision, and to take the advice of his holiness. The Virgin appeared to S. Thomas when an exile in France, foretold his martyrdom, and that the *fifth* King after Henry II. would be "vir benignus ac Ecclesiæ Dei pugil." She gave the Saint an ampulla of most holy oil. The King anointed by that oil would recover the Holy Land. S. Thomas gave the oil to a monk of the Convent of S. Cyprian in Poitiers. The same monk also received a plate with an inscription which he only could read. (The oil was as that revealed to Pope Leo, with which Archbishop Turpin anointed Charlemagne.) When the King of the Pagans heard that this oil was concealed at Poitiers, he sent a Christian and a Pagan to get it. The Pagan died; the Christian bought it with the Pagan's money, and carried it to Germany, where it came into the possession of the Duke of Brabant. Edward might have been anointed with it at his coronation through his kinsman the Duke of Brabant, but, content with his usual anointing, had refused. Its virtue had now been proved by a miracle wrought on the Duchess of Brabant. Edward now gravely attributes all his misfortunes to his refusal of this oil. Still he would not be a second time anointed without the sanction of the Pope. Pope John treats the matter with solemn seriousness. He consults with a Cardinal. He decides that as "no observation of days or hours is enjoined," it is not superstitious to believe in the oil; it would not interfere with the former unction. The Pope, however, refuses to authorise any prelate to do it: the King may get it done, but secretly (clam), for fear of raising too much astonishment. The Pope in conclusion suddenly turns round, and wisely says "that a virtuous life will be more efficacious: it will be of more real value to the King to protect the Church of Rome and her liberties"—the Papal notion of virtue! All this is from the Pope's own letter.—MS. B. M., June 2, 1318.

In England the war had become popular, national.[m] The clergy did not dare or did not desire to withhold their contributions; but the heavier taxation of the Crown made them more impatient of the taxation of the See of Rome by first-fruits, annates, reservations, and direct burthens, carried to an unprecedented height by the need or the avarice of the Avignonese Pontiffs;[n] and they had been almost entirely alienated from Rome by their hostility to the foreign prelates intruded into the richest benefices of the kingdom.[o] Throughout this long reign England was becoming less hierarchical, the hierarchy more English.

Archbishop of Canterbury.

Nothing shows more clearly the change in the national opinion and in the times than the relation of the King and the Primate of the realm. One Archbishop of Canterbury, Stratford, a few years after Edward III.'s accession,[p] is arraigned of high treason; he declares himself in danger of capital punishment, though

[m] The Cardinal Legates, in 1346, about June, instead of being received with honour, were received "plerumque conviciis, contemptibus, et injuriis;" they are in peril of being "pro bono opere *lapidati*." The Pope instructs them not to expose themselves to danger, to have guards against *popular* riot, to take care that everything is written.—MS. B. M., Aug. 28, vol. xxii. p. 194.

[n] In MS. B. M. Clement VI. complains to Queen Isabella and Queen Philippa, and to the King's Council (Aug. 28, 1343), that certain proctors of his Cardinals, in England on business, had been ignominiously expelled the realm. He claims (July 7, 1344) reserves of all vacant benefices for two years, on account of the poverty of the Roman See (vol. xxi. p. 190). He writes to the King complaining of Acts of Parliament against Reservations and Provisions. He asserts himself "ecclesiarum omnium tanquam Pastor Universalis." The King's interference is impious. The Acts are "in derogationem et enervationem prædictæ libertatis ecclesiasticæ, Primatus ejusdem Romanæ ecclesiæ et auctoritatis et potestatis ipsius sedis Aplicæ." Persons had been sacrilegiously imprisoned for disobedience to these Acts. He threatens divine vengeance. Jan. 30, 1345. Clement protests that he had not sent his Legates to fulminate censures or excommunications: they were only sent peaceably to endeavour to persuade the King to give up the obnoxious statutes (p. 472). The Bishopric of Ely is a reservation. Thomas de Insulâ, penitentiarius noster, but (oriundus) of English race, *recommended* to the King.

[o] The King had taken, or borrowed "sub obligatione congruâ," all the "proventus et redditus" of benefices held by foreigners (alienigenas) for the support and necessities of the realm, deducting the burthens on them." The Pope (Clement) wonders at his audacity. It was not by the advice of "periti," but "imperiti," that he occupied "bona Ecclesiastica, in quibus, sicut nosti, nulla laicis est attributa potestas." The "color quæsitus crediti non excusat." Let the King's counsellors observe "quod multi ex fratribus nostris Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus in Regno tuo prædicto beneficia obtinentes, qui circa nos universali Ecclesiæ serviendo singularum Ecclesiarum commoditatibus utiliter se impendunt." Those not resident in "obsequio nostro," or for other just causes, were to be considered resident. Clement entreats the King, for the good of his soul, to give up his sacrilegious design. April 24, 1346. Compare letter, April 28, 1347.

[p] Stratford, Archbishop, 1333. Edward III., viii.

the King disclaims such intention. The crime of which the Primate is, probably without justice, accused, is a secular offence—the malversation of subsidies levied for the French war. The Archbishop flies from Lambeth (two other bishops, Lichfield and Chichester, the King's treasurers, had been sent to the Tower). At Canterbury he ventures to excommunicate his accusers, the King's counsellors, with bell, book, and candle. He returns to London, but shrouds himself under the privileges of Parliament rather than under his ecclesiastical immunity. He forces his way, himself bearing his cross, into the House of Peers, as his place of security, his one safe sanctuary. He is at last obliged to submit, ere he can be admitted to compurgation, to an investigation before a jury of twelve of his peers—four prelates and eight nobles. The quarrel is settled by amicable intervention, but the King grants rather than condescends to accept pardon.[q] This arraignment of Becket's successor without a general insurrection of the Church, with no Papal remonstrance, though Stratford himself held the loftiest doctrines on the superiority of the priest to the layman, is an ominous sign. A second Primate, Simon Langham, having accepted a Cardinal's hat, lives in exile. A third (under Richard II.), Simon Sudbury, is cruelly murdered by the peasants of Kent; yet the land is darkened with no interdict; the martyr is canonised neither by the fear of the people nor the reverence of the clergy. A fourth, Arundel, is arraigned of high treason, sees his brother the Earl of Arundel, executed before his face for a conspiracy, in which himself is concerned, flees for safety to the continent, returns only under the protection of Henry Bolingbroke. That usurper (Henry IV.) hesitates not to strike off the head of the Archbishop of York for capital treason; and so sunken is the Pope through the Schism, that there is but a feeble shadow of remonstrance at this sacrilegious violation of the canon law. He vindicates the conduct of the King with an elaborate apology, and hastens to bestow his absolution on all concerned in the execution.[r]

[q] Godwin de Præsulibus. Vit. Stratford.

[r] See MS. B. M. Gregory XI. to the Bishops of Durham and Lincoln. He

The three great Statutes.

It was not indeed till the reign of Richard II. that the three great limitary Statutes—of Mortmain, of Provisors, and of Præmunire (the two first less stringently enacted before) took their perfect form—together the Great Charter, as it were, of English liberties against the Church. One had risen above the other. The first, Mortmain, set an impassable bound to the all-absorbing acquisitions of the Church, and the severance of the land into one sacred and one common territory—the sacred slowly encroaching till it threatened to swallow up the other.[s] The second, Provisors, wrested away the Papal power of disposing at least of all the benefices in the patronage of spiritual persons.[t] The third, Præmunire, boldly and openly vindicated the right of the State of England to prohibit the admission or the execution of all Papal Bulls or Briefs within the realm, a virtual prophetic, premonitory declaration of the King's supremacy.[u]

Birth of Wycliffe.

About three years[x] before the accession of Edward III., was born of humble parentage in a village near Richmond in Yorkshire, John Wycliffe, who was to give lasting celebrity to the name of his obscure birthplace.[y] His destination, either from his own choice or the wise providence of his parents, was that of a scholar, to which the humblest could in those days aspire. England was almost a land of schools; every Cathedral, almost every Monastery, had its own; but youths of more ambition, self-confidence, supposed capacity, and of better opportunities, thronged to Oxford and Cambridge, now in their highest repute. In England, as

Movement to the Universities.

dwells on the undoubted treason of Scrope, by which his life was forfeited to the laws of the land, "licet Archiepiscopus præfatus deliquerit, correctio tamen et punitio secundum canonum instituta ecclesiastico judici fuerit relinquenda." Yet the danger to the King and the urgency of his friends fully justify the act. The interdict issued by the more virtuous and bolder Innocent VII. is annulled; all processes declared void; the Bishops have plenary authority to reconcile every one who had any hand in the affair.—Lucca, April 13, 1408.

[s] Compare on the successive statutes and final law of Mortmain, Blackstone, c. 18.

[t] On Provisors, consult a book of greater merit than fame, "England under the House of Lancaster" (London, 1852), p. 396. The abandonment of those in lay patronage was a prudent concession of the Pope. See Lingard, vol. iii. p. 108.

[u] On Præmunire, 16 Richd. II. c. 5. Hallam, Middle Ages, ii. p. 48.

[x] 1324-1327.

[y] This seems clearly proved by Lewis and Vaughan, the biographers of Wycliffe.

throughout Christendom, that wonderful rush, as it were, of a vast part of the population towards knowledge, thronged the Universities with thousands of students, instead of the few hundreds who have now the privilege of entering those seats of instruction. This silent, regular, peaceful, and as yet inexhaustible crusade for the conquest of University learning, for the worship of the Schoolmen and the Doctors, for the adoration of the reliques of ancient religious and even philosophical wisdom, for the discovery of the Aristotelian or Arabian Dialectics, arose in great degree out of the state of society. There were in truth but two professions, Arms and the Church. But Arms—though the English yeomen, her archers, crossbowmen, and bill-men had now begun to make their importance felt in the continental wars—was, as to distinction at least, an aristocratic profession. The demand for foot soldiers, though on the increase, was limited and precarious. They were mostly raised for a short and hasty campaign, and dismissed again by their suzerain. The regular troops, and even the Free Bands, formed but a small part of the population. But the Church was constantly needing, constantly drawing from all quarters, recruits for her service: and that not only for her own special functions, most lawyers, physicians, even statesmen, were ecclesiastics. The Monastic establishments, the Friars in their various Orders, absorbed undiminished multitudes. The Church had no succession in herself. Not that married clergy were unknown or unfrequent, or that the canonical proscription could exclude the sons of the clergy, though held illegitimate, from holy orders, or the inheritance of patrimonial benefices.[z] Still these were few in proportion to the inexhaustible demand. The vast mass of the secular clergy, all those in the inferior Orders (the noble, even royal, families furnished some prelates and rich beneficiaries) as well as the Monks and Friars, came from below. It was the great strength, as among the great blessings of the hierarchy, that the meanest might themselves aspire to be, or might see their kindred, be-

[z] Compare vol. v. p. 72.

68291

come the most learned, wealthy, powerful in the realm—Bishops, Chancellors, Archbishops, Cardinals, even Popes.

Wycliffe at Oxford.

John Wycliffe found his way to Oxford; he was admitted into Queen's College, then just founded by Philippa of Hainault, Queen of Edward III. He removed to Merton, the older, wealthier, and more famous of the Oxford foundations.

The English Universities had already begun to take their peculiar character, a league, as it were, of separate, independent Colleges, each a distinct republic, with its endowments, statutes, internal government; though the University was still paramount, and the Chancellor, with his inferior officers, held the supreme, all-embracing authority. These colleges were founded for the maintenance of poor scholars by Statesmen, Prelates, Princes, Kings, Queens. There were now six of these colleges in Oxford, as distinguished from the halls or hostels, where the other scholars dwelt and studied only under the ordinary academic discipline.[a] Walter de Merton, Chancellor of Henry III., was the founder of that noble institution. De Merton, though he introduced, according to the habits of his time, much of the monastic discipline, the common diet, seclusion within the walls, regular service and study: perhaps as a churchman, possibly with even more widely-prophetic view, was singularly jealous lest his college should degenerate into a narrow monastic community. Whoever became a monk was expelled from his fellowship. Merton, among her older students, might offer famous names to excite the pride and emulation of her scholars. She boasted the venerable tradition of Duns Scotus, the rival of the most renowned of the Schoolmen, of Aquinas himself. Roger Bacon probably was an object as much of awe as of admiration, as little comprehended by Wycliffe as by the most supercilious churchman or narrow-minded monk. But if only the name of William of Ockham, the Locke of the Middle Ages in his common-sense philosophy, and in the single-minded worship of truth, were held in reverence;

[a] All this has been well wrought out in the report of the Oxford University Commission. See also the Histories of Oxford.

if his works were studied, it could be no wonder if the scholars of Merton indulged in speculations perilous to the Pope, to the hierarchy, even to the imaginative creed of the Middle Ages. The bold and rigid nominalism of Ockham struck at the root of all the mystic allegoric theology; it endangered some of the Church doctrines. His high imperialist Apologies shattered the foundations of the Papal Supremacy, and reduced the hierarchy below the Throne. The last renowned teacher of divinity at Merton had been the profound Bradwardine, whose great learning (he was celebrated as a geometer as well as a theologian), his lowliness, and admirable piety, had made a strong impression on his age. He had just lived to be Archbishop of Canterbury.[b] Bradwardine may have left his influence on the mind of Wycliffe in his severe Augustinian Predestinarianism, a doctrine in which the more austere churchmen and all the first Reformers (or they would hardly have dared to be Reformers) met as to its theory, if not its application. Famous men of Merton.

Wycliffe's fame in Oxford, his promotion to offices of high trust and honour, and his writings, are the only testimonies to the extent and depth of his academic studies; his logic, his scholastic subtlety, some rhetorical art, his power of reading the Latin Scriptures, his various erudition, may be due to Oxford; but the vigour and energy of his genius, his perspicacity, the force of his language, his mastery over the vernacular English, the high supremacy which he vindicated for the Scriptures, which by immense toil he promulgated in the vulgar tongue—these were his own, to be learned in no school, to be attained by none of the ordinary courses of study. As with his contemporary and most congenial spirit, Chaucer, rose English Poetry, in its strong homely breadth and humour, in the wonderful delineation of character with its finest shades, in its plain, manly good sense and kindly feeling (some of its richness and fancifulness it might owe to Italy and France): so was Wycliffe the Father of English Prose, rude but idiomatic, biblical in much of its picturesque

[b] Collier, i. 552. Godwin de Præsulibus. Bradwardine survived his consecration only five weeks and four days.

phraseology, at once highly coloured by and colouring the Translation of the Scriptures.

Great obscurity hangs over the earliest publications of Wycliffe, obscurity further darkened by the publication of the tract called "The Last Age of the Church."[c] If this be genuine, Wycliffe must have been in danger of sinking into a wild follower of the Fraticelli, the believers in the visions of the Abbot Joachim. A profoundly religious mind like Wycliffe's may have brooded over the awful plague which a few years before had devastated Europe,[d] and might be accepted as a sign of the Last Days by devout men. The treatise may have been composed at that period, or the darkness then impressed upon his mind may have dispersed but slowly. The denunciations of the Tract are against the Clergy, the Simonians, and holders of great benefices;[e] no word against his future enemies, the Mendicants.

It was by his fearless and unsparing attack on the Mendicant Friars that Wycliffe rose into fame, honour, and popularity at Oxford. The Mendicants in England, as everywhere else (now four Orders), had swarmed in their irresistible numbers. Here, too, they had invaded every stronghold of the clergy, the University, the city, the village parish. Here, too, the Clergy clamoured, and with unrelaxing clamour, that these intruders entered into their cures, withdrew their flocks from the discipline of the Church, intercepted the offerings, estranged their affections, heard confessions with more indulgent ears, granted absolution on easier terms. Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who before his Irish Primacy had been Chancellor of Oxford, a man of high character, had denounced them as utterly destructive of true religion. The Mendicants strove hard in Oxford, as heretofore in Paris and all the other Universities, to obtain the ascendancy, either

[c] We are indebted for this publication, from the library of Trinity College, to the learned Dr. Todd of Dublin. Dr. Todd appears to me more completely sceptical as to its authenticity than he admits himself to be. The only authority for its genuineness is, that it appears in a volume which contains other tracts by Wycliffe; and that a Tract under this name is recounted among his works by the inaccurate Bishop Bale, and on his authority received by Lewis, who had not seen it.

[d] A.D. 1347-8-9. Ann. ætat. Wyclyffe, 23-4-5.

[e] Both vengeance of swerde and myschiefe unknown before, by which man thes daise should be punished, shall fall for synne of prestis, &c. &c.—p. xxxiv.

from their ambition, their conscious pride in their great theologians, or as foreseeing the brooding rebellion of more free inquiry and a bolder speculative philosophy, which themselves had unknowingly fostered by some of their sons. They were accused of trepanning the youth who were sent up to the Universities.[f] Parents were afraid to risk their sons, who without their consent were enlisted into the Mendicant Orders. The number of scholars is said to have sunk from 30,000 to 6000. The Friars were at the same time ambitious of the honours of the University. They claimed degrees on their own terms, and demanded that the Statutes of the University which limited the age at which youths might become Friars should yield to their own.[g] Appeal was made to Rome. Urban V. condemned the Statutes in the strongest terms. Cambridge was equally guilty with Oxford in vigorous resistance to all encroachments on the University. And it appears not that the Universities obeyed the mandate to repeal their Statutes.[h]

Wycliffe struck boldly at the root of the evil: he denounced Mendicancy in itself. He denied, with vigour of argument which might have won the favour of John XXII., that Christ was a Mendicant; he dwelt on their blasphemy in likening their institutes to the Gospel, their founder to the Saviour. He treated all the Orders and both the classes among the Franciscans with the same asperity. He branded the higher as hypocrites, who, professing mendicancy, had stately houses, rode on noble horses, had all the pride and luxury of wealth with the ostentation of poverty. The humbler he denounced with all his indignation as common able-bodied beggars, who ought not to be permitted to infest the land.[i]

[f] The University, the Chancellor and Regents, passed a Statute, that none should be received into the Orders of the Friars under fifteen years old. Lewis, p. 5, 6.

[g] Ibid.

[h] MS. B. M. The Pope Urban V. declares that the statute "canonicis obviat institutis." The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops are to order the Chancellor, summariè et de plano, ac sine strepitu et figurâ judicii, to repeal the statute, and this without appeal, June 1, 1365. The second letter condemns Cambridge as Oxford. The regulations are "dilectioni Dei dissona, proximis noxia et sacris traditionibus inimica." The Archbishop, the Bishops of Llandaff (London?) and Bangor, are to cite the Universities to show cause why they have enacted such statutes. In the mean time the Pope suspends their execution. July 19, 1365.

[i] The opinions of the austerer Franciscans that Christ and his Apostles were absolutely without property had been

So far Wycliffe was the champion of a great party in the University and in the Church. Honours, dignities crowded upon him. He was Warden of Baliol Hall, on the presentation of Baliol College,[k] Rector of Fylingham, Warden of Canterbury Hall. His last appointment plunged Wycliffe into litigation, and into an appeal to the Court of Rome.

1361-1365. Preferments. Canterbury Hall.

Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury, had endeavoured in his foundation of Canterbury Hall to blend together the Monastic and Secular Clergy. Of twelve fellows the Warden and three were monks from Christ Church in Canterbury, eight secular Clergy. The Hall was endowed with the Rectory of Pagenham in Sussex, and a manor, Wingford, in Northamptonshire. One Wodehull was named Warden. Wodehull is described as a turbulent and violent man:[m] the scheme of amicable union broke up. Just before his death Islip dispossessed Wodehull and the monks; the Hall was surrendered altogether to the Seculars; Wycliffe was named Warden. Simon Langham became Archbishop; Langham was a monk by education and character.[n] It was alleged that the act of his predecessor Islip was extorted from him in a state of imbecility. Langham annulled the proceeding, and reinstated Wodehull; Wycliffe resisted; the Archbishop endeavoured to compel submission by the sequestration of the Pagenham Rectory; Wycliffe appealed to the Pope. This was his only resource; it implies no confidence in the justice of the Papal Court; it is consistent with serious misgivings as to his own chance of obtaining impartial justice; it was but the common order of things.

Wycliffe's fame was not confined to Oxford; his opinion was demanded by the Crown on a subject of grave importance. The Pope Urban V. had been so unwise at this

publicly taught in London by Roger Conway, a Minorite; opposed by Richard Kilmyngton, Dean of St. Paul's, and by Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who was born in London. In Oxford they were preached in 1360, opposed by Wycliffe, Thoresby Archbishop of York, and others.

[k] Doubt has been thrown on his Baliol preferment by Mr. Courthope. See England under Henry of Lancaster, note iv. p. 356.

[m] Wodehull was unpopular in the University; it was with great difficulty that he was admitted to his degree.—Lewis.

[n] Simon Langham was hated by a large party in the Church, as appears from the well-known verses—

Exultant cœli quia Simon venit ab Ely:
Cujus ad adventum flent in Kent millia centum.

juncture as to demand the arrears of the 1000 marks, of which so much has been heard, the tribute and acknowledgment of fealty to the Roman See. That ignominious burthen had now been allowed to accumulate for thirty-three years. Urban was urged to the demand by his poverty, covetousness, or desire of embarrassing King Edward. Wycliffe was commanded to answer some bold Doctor who maintained the right of the Pope. As royal chaplain he was present at a solemn debate in the King's Council; he recites the opinions delivered by seven of the barons, singularly curious and characteristic. To these Wycliffe, as a humble and obedient son of the Roman Church, protesting that he held nothing injurious to that Church or offensive to pious ears, refers his own adversary before he begins his argument. The first was a frank, warlike Peer, of few, plain words:—"Our ancestors won this realm and held it against all foes by the sword. Julius Cæsar exacted tribute by force; force gives no perpetual right. Let the Pope come and take it by force; I am ready to stand up and resist him." The second was more argumentative:—"The Pope is incapable of such feudal supremacy. He should follow the example of Christ, who refused all civil dominion; the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air their nest, he had not where to lay his head. Let us rigidly hold the Pope to his spiritual duties, boldly oppose all his claims to civil power." The third said:—"The Pope calls himself the Servant of the Servants of the Most High; his only claim to tribute from this realm is for some service done; but what is his service to this realm? Not spiritual edification, but draining away money to enrich himself and his Court, showing favour and counsel to our enemies." The fourth:—"The Pope claims to be the suzerain of all estates held by the Church; these estates held in mortmain amount to one-third of the realm. There cannot be two suzerains; the Pope, therefore, for these estates is the King's vassal; he has not done homage for them; he may have incurred forfeiture." The fifth was more subtle:—"If the Pope demands this money as the price of King John's absolution it is flagrant simony: it is an irreligious act to say, 'I will absolve you on payment of a certain annual tribute;' but the King pays

not this tax; it is wrung from the poor of the realm; to exact it is an act of avarice rather than salutary punishment. If the Pope be lord of the realm, he may at any time declare it forfeited, and grant away the forfeiture." The sixth was even more vigorous in his retort:—"If the realm be the Pope's, what right had he to alienate it? He has fraudulently sold it for not a fifth part of its value. Moreover, Christ alone is the suzerain; the Pope being fallible may be in mortal sin. It is better, as of old, to hold the realm immediately of Christ." The seventh boldly denied the right of John to surrender the realm:—"He could not grant it away in his folly; the whole, the Royal Charter, signature, seal, is an absolute nullity." Wycliffe in his own resolute vindication of resistance to the Pope's claim had alluded to the peril which himself incurred lest he should be defamed at the Court of Rome, and incur ecclesiastical censure and loss of benefices.[o] It cannot be known how far this act or the character of Wycliffe influenced the decision of the Court of Rome in his appeal; but after some delay Canterbury Hall was adjudged to the monks of Christ Church; Wodehull was again appointed Master.[p]

A.D. 1371. 45 Edward III.

Just at this juncture appeared a clearer sign and an omen that the popular mind had begun to look with jealousy on the power of the hierarchy. In the Parliament of 1371 the Commons addressed the Crown with a remonstrance against the appointment of Churchmen to all the great dignities of State, and a petition that laymen might be chosen for those secular offices. The King answered that he would consult with his Council on the matter. The connection of Wycliffe or Wycliffe's opinions with this movement does not appear, or how far Wycliffe had as yet urged those principles which at a later time he expressed so strongly. The movement was generally attributed to John of Gaunt, to John of Gaunt, the patron of Chaucer, the protector, as will soon appear, of Wycliffe against the hierarchy.

Parliament petition against Hierarchy.

[o] Primo ut persona mea sic ad Romanam curiam diffamata, et aggravatis censuris ab ecclesiasticis beneficiis sit privata.—Apud Lewis, p. 351, where the whole may be read at length.

[p] Richard Benger, who ought to have stood as proctor for Wycliffe, did not appear: he was declared contumacious. Judgement seems to have gone by default.

The blow was aimed principally at William of Wykeham, that magnificent Prelate, who from the surveyor and architect of the King (Windsor owes its royal splendour to King Edward), had become Bishop of Winchester, Chancellor, and at the head of all affairs of State. The blow was not without effect. Wykeham ceased to be Chancellor; the Bishop of Exeter resigned the treasurership. In writings of which the date is doubtful, Wycliffe directly inveighs against this abuse:—"Neither prelates, nor doctors, priests nor deacons, should hold secular offices, that is those of chancery, treasury, privy-seal, and other such temporal offices in the exchequer; neither be stewards of lands, nor stewards of the hall, nor clerks of the kitchen, nor clerks of accounts; neither be occupied in any secular office in lords' courts, more especially while secular men are sufficient to do such offices." In another passage there is a bitter and manifest allusion to Wykeham:—"Benefices, instead of being bestowed on poor clerks, are heaped on a kitchen clerk, or one wise in building castles, or in worldly business."[q]

Wycliffe's position in Oxford was not lowered by his expulsion from the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall. He became Doctor, Professor of Divinity; that is, as Doctor he had the right of delivering lectures on theology. From the public chair he had full opportunity of promulgating his own views; we know not how far as yet from the intrepid antagonist of the Mendicants he had become the open adversary of the wealthier hierarchy; how far he had departed from the established creed. We know not whether Wycliffe had now advanced beyond Oxford, or Oxford advanced as far as Wycliffe. From a man of unimpeachable morals, profound devotion, undoubted sincerity, vigour, and original eloquence, much denunciation against the abuses of the time, the enormous pride, wealth, luxury, loose morals, secular pursuits of the

Wycliffe Professor at Oxford.

[q] Apud Vaughan, i. 312. See another striking passage on the incompatibility of such offices with thoughtfulness about heavenly things. Piers Ploughman is strong on this grievance of the higher Clergy:—

Some serven the Kinge, and his selver tellen,
In the Checkkere and the Chauncelrie, chalengynge his dettes,
Of Wardes and of Wardemotes, wayves and strayes.

—Whitaker's Edition, p. 5.

higher Clergy, might be at once so popular and so true, that on the one hand a formidable host of partisans might form themselves around the dauntless Professor, while on the other he might give no hold for specific charges either of hostility to the Church or of heretical pravity. There was a wide field for safe freedom; his enemies in condemning Wycliffe would be pleading guilty to his charges.

The nomination of Wycliffe by the Crown as second in a commission to treat with the Papal Legate at Bruges, in the great questions at issue between the King of England and the Pope, shows his growing importance, his high esteem with some person powerful in Parliament and at Court, probably John of Gaunt, and strong confidence in his courage and ability.[r] That the Pope, a Pope of the high character and rigour of Gregory XI., should condescend to negotiations on such subjects, which he was wont to decide by fulminating censures, was in itself a sign of change. John Bishop of Bangor and two others, a Benedictine monk and a knight, appeared as Edward's ambassadors at Avignon. They complained in no measured terms of the Papal interference with royal patronage, of provisors and reservations, and the citations of the King's subjects in the Court of Rome.[s] The Pope, on his side, appealed to the notorious fact that the Apostolic Briefs were not permitted to be published in England; that his Nuncios were not admitted to the realm, as in every other kingdom of the faithful. The meeting at Bruges was to settle those differences by amicable concession; the Pope appointed the Bishops of Pampeluna and Sinigaglia as his ambassadors.[t]

During these disputes between the Crown of England and the Pope throughout the reign of the Edwards, a third

[r] Did Edward consider Wycliffe to come up to the Pope's description of the ambassadors? The King ought to send men "claros scientiâ ac laudandæ virtutis, et cunctâ prudentiâ præditos, cultores justitiæ, sedulosque pacis et concordiæ zelatores."—MS. B. M. May 1, 1374.

[s] The Bishop of Lincoln had been cited to Avignon to answer for impeding the collection of the Pope's subsidy from the Clergy. On this subject the Pope was forced to be bold.

[t] There are many papers of Instructions to the Papal Commissioners. The meeting was appointed for St. John Baptist's Day, 1374, by different adjournments postponed to Easter, 1375. It took place in July. All suits in the meantime were suspended in the Papal as in the King's courts.

party had begun to intervene, and with increasing weight. The Parliament were determined and obstinate in their resistance to the burthens imposed on the kingdom and on the Clergy by the Papal Court; and they were strong, as representing the will of the nation, and sure that their resistance was not disapproved by the King. It was not perhaps the taxation of the Clergy to which they were so resolutely opposed, so much as the continual drain of specie, which was considered as the impoverishment of the realm, and was as yet but imperfectly prevented by the bills of exchange, brought into use chiefly by the Lombard and Italian bankers.[u] The old grievance, too, still offended the whole realm, the Clergy as well as the people—the possession of so many of the most wealthy benefices by foreigners, some of whom had never entered the kingdom, some but for a short time; most were unacquainted with the language of the country. These revenues in hard money were transmitted to Rome or to Avignon, to be spent on the luxuries of Cardinals or Papal favourites. Parliament with one indignant voice declared the surrender of the realm by John null and void, as without the consent of Parliament, and contrary to the King's coronation oath. Both estates, Lords and Commons, asserted their determination to stand by the King against the usurpations of the Pope.[x] Parliament was as resolute against the other abuse. The first Statute of Provisors had been passed in the reign of Edward I.[y] Twice already in the reign of Edward III. was this law re-enacted with penalties rising one above another in severity. It was declared that the Court of Rome could present to no bishopric or benefice in England. Whoever disturbed a patron in the presentation to a living suffered fine and ransom to the King, and was imprisoned till he renounced the provision. To cite the King to appear in the Court of Rome was highly penal.[z] Yet ten years after A.D. 1373. arose new complaints, *embodied in an address*

[u] From the Papal Letters (MS. B. M.) may be gleaned many curious particulars about the agency of these bankers, Siennese and Florentines.

[x] 40th Edw. III. Blackstone, iv. c. 8, from Selden.

[y] *35th Edw. I.*

[z] *25th Edw. III. (1351); 27th Edw.* III. (1353); 38th Edw. III. (1363); Blackstone, iv. c. viii.

of the Commons to the King on the subject of provisions and first-fruits. The King answered that negotiations were proceeding with the Pope for the amicable adjustment of these claims, that a commission of the Bishop of Bangor had been already sent to Gregory XI.—a Pope whose character commanded respect—in Avignon.[a] The new commission, in which Wycliffe was named, proceeded in the next year to meet the Papal Legates at Bruges.

Wycliffe Commissioner at Bruges.

Wycliffe was at Bruges not quite two months.[b] The result of the conference was reported to Avignon. If the discussion at Bruges had any effect on the course of the negotiation, nothing could be finally determined but by the Pope himself. A kind of compact was at length made, rather a suspension of arms than a definitive peace. The Pope revoked all the reservations made by Urban V., his predecessor, which had not taken effect. He confirmed the nomination of all presented by the King without first-fruits. The benefices held by the Cardinals were made liable to the repairs of the Church and the buildings belonging thereunto. He quashed all the causes pending in his courts on the subject of Provisors. On his side the King remitted all the fines incurred under the three Statutes of Provisors. Thus each might seem to await better times to renew his claim. The Pope surrendered no right of future reservation or provi-

A.D. 1376.

[a] The milder, it might almost be said the meek, tone of Gregory XI. singularly contrasts with that of his predecessors. The Archbishopric of York was a Papal reservation. On the vacancy the Chapter (forsan ignari of this) elected Alexander Neville. The Pope has the judgement to cede the point, though he still asserts his right. He annuls the proceedings of the Chapter, but nominates Alexander (April 14, 1374). He presents his nephew, Adhemar de Rupe, Provost of S. Saviour's in Utrecht, to the much-coveted Archdeaconry of Canterbury as a reserve. But his letter to the King is no stern dictate; it is a prayer for the royal favour, which is most powerful in such affairs (1374). A year after he writes to the Bishop of Winchester to instal his nephew (Sept. 20, 1375). There is a very curious letter addressed to William de Lucumer (qu. Lord Latimer) on the imprisonment of Roger de Beaufort and another nephew of his own, John de Rupe. He does not peremptorily order their release, but complains that they are ignominiously treated, "præter morem erga nobiles," and only implores more gentle usage in their behalf.—May, 1375.

[b] The accounts in the Exchequer show that Wycliffe was absent from July 27 to Sept. 14, 1375. He received 60*l.* for his expenses at 20 shillings a day: for passage 50*s.*, for re-passage 42*s.* 3*d.*, quoted in Preface to Wycliffe's Bible, Oxford, p. vii.

sion.[c] The prohibitory Statutes, with all their formidable penalties, remained unrepealed.[d]

Whatever were Wycliffe's services at Bruges, or his actions, they did not pass unrewarded. He had already exchanged the Rectory of Fylingham (in the Archdeaconry of Stowe, Diocese of Lincoln) for that of Ludgershall, nearer to Oxford. He now received from the Crown the Prebend of Aust in Worcester, and the Rectory, which he occupied till his death, of Lutterworth.

During the last two years of Edward III.'s reign, the sad and gloomy close of that reign of splendour and glory,[e] there is a strange collision and confusion of religious and political interests, from which John Wycliffe emerges now a dangerous and dreaded heresiarch. The Good Parliament is ejecting from the administration John of Gaunt, the favourer of the new opinions, and filling the council of the King with High Churchmen; at the same time it is presenting petitions against the abuse of the Papal power, such as might have been drawn by Wycliffe himself. Wycliffe is arraigned for perilous doctrines before the Bishop of London, openly protected by John of Gaunt. John of Gaunt is almost the victim of popular fury, which in a short time after appears as violently espousing the cause of Wycliffe. It may not be impossible to find the clue to guide us through this intricate labyrinth. The nation, now for the first time in the history of the constitution represented by the House of Commons, was under the influence of two strong passions. The strongest and the predominant was that of deep attachment and veneration for the Black Prince, the chivalrous hero of the French wars. The only blot on his fame was his cruelty[f] in those wars, to them no way odious. The Black Prince had led a King captive through the streets of London; he had

[c] Yet both the archbishoprics, the bishoprics, and rich abbeys continued frequently to be nominated to by the Pope. He ceased only in general to promote foreigners, *i. e.* eodem anno Papa transtulit dominum Thomas Arundel, Episc. Elien. ad Archiepiscop. Eborac. Alexandro Neville proditore et susurrone translato ad Episcop. S. Andreæ in Scotiâ.—Walsingham, 336.

[d] In the year 1390 (Rich. II. 15) the Commons extorted the renewal of the Statute of Provisors in the strongest terms.

[e] "And sorrow's faded form, and solitude behind."—*Gray.*

[f] The barbarous massacre at Limoges.

not only glutted the English pride with glory, he had won all hearts by his affability, his generous, gracious and noble demeanour. He was the model of perfect chivalry. The love of the Black Prince became jealousy, almost hatred, of John of Gaunt, supposed to be his rival. The Duke of Lancaster, while they were trembling with too well-grounded apprehensions for the waning life of their idol, was thought to be brooding over more sinister schemes of ambition. Their second passion was the old steady determination to emancipate the realm from the abuses of the Papal power, with some growing jealousy of the native hierarchy.

Edward III. was almost in his dotage, absolutely governed, it was believed, by John of Gaunt, by Latimer his partisan the Lord Chancellor, and by Alice Perrers, who had not only infatuated the old man as a mistress, but was accused of having bewitched him by forbidden sorceries. Dark rumours were abroad that John of Gaunt designed to supplant the young Richard of Bourdeaux on the demise of his father. So much was he hated that credence was given to a wild story (attributed, falsely no doubt, to William of Wykeham) that John of Gaunt was but a suppositious child, the son of a Flemish woman, substituted in the place of a dead daughter of the King. The Black Prince, sinking into mortal languor, seemed to rally with a father's energy to maintain the imperilled rights of his infant son. On his party were the powerful Churchmen, Courtenay Bishop of London, and Wykeham of Winchester. But the most intrepid and useful partisan was Peter de la Mare, Speaker of the House of Commons. De la Mare was steward of the Earl of March, who had married the daughter of Lionel Duke of Clarence, the second (deceased) son of Edward III. From the Earl of March sprang the House of York, hereafter to wrest the crown from the Lancastrian lineage of John of Gaunt.

The Good Parliament.

Parliament, for the first time led by the Commons, demanded the dismissal of the King's advisers (against whose maladministration of the realm they presented grievous complaints), and that ten or twelve Prelates and Peers should be called to the royal Council: at the head of this Council were the Churchmen, the Arch-

bishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Winchester. The new Council assumed its powers.[g] Latimer, John Lord Neville, Sir Richard Stafford, were ignominiously dismissed; Alice Perrers was prohibited, under pain of forfeiture and banishment, from approaching the Court. Popular sympathy denominated this assembly "the Good Parliament." But these political measures were not their only acts. A petition was presented from which it might seem that in their view the Statutes of Provisors had been altogether inefficient. The taxes paid to the Church of Rome amounted, they averred, to "five times as much as those levied by the King; the Pope disposed of the same bishoprics by reservations four or five times, and received each time the first-fruits."[h] "The brokers of the sinful city of Rome promoted for money unlearned and unworthy caitiffs to benefices of the value of a thousand marks, while the poor and learned hardly obtain one of twenty. So decays sound learning. They present aliens, who neither see nor care to see their parishioners, despise God's service, convey away the treasure of the realm, and are worse than Jews or Saracens. God gave his sheep to the Pope to be pastured, not shorn and shaven; lay patrons are by his example urged to sell their benefices to mere brutes, as Christ was sold to the Jews. The Pope's revenue from England alone is larger than that of any prince in Christendom. The Pope's collector and other strangers have an office in London, from whence are betrayed the secrets of the realm; the collector remits yearly to the Pope 20,000 marks, sometimes more." The Commons insist on the immediate discharge of these traitorous and dangerous strangers. They appear to adopt a return made of the Crown Benefices held by aliens. The Cardinal of S. Sabina held the Deanery of Lichfield with annexed Prebends, worth 580 marks and 20*l.*; the Cardinal of S. Prassede had for twenty-six years held the Deanery of Salisbury, which he never saw, worth 254*l.*, and many valuable benefices annexed to it; the Cardinal of S.

[g] See in Lowth's William of Wykeham the names of the Council.

[h] See the petition in the Parliamentary History. Compare it with Wycliffe's views.

Angelo the Deanery of York, worth 400*l.*, with many other Prebends; others were Archdeacons of Canterbury (the richest benefice in England after the Bishoprics), of Suffolk, of York, of Durham; others possessed Prebends and various preferments. They received besides that the 20,000 marks a year.[i]

The remedies the Commons proposed were the re-enactment and enforcement of the Statute of Provisors with the utmost rigour. They demanded that no foreign proctor or collector of the Pope should be permitted to remain in England under pain of life and limb; any Englishman residing at Rome in such office to be liable to the same penalty.

The Good Parliament was dissolved; before its dissolution the Black Prince had died. John of Gaunt resumed the administration. The Council was ignominiously dismissed; Alice Perrers was by the bedside of the King, now worn out with age, infirmity, and sorrow. The Earl of March was ordered to Calais, under the honourable pretext of surveying the castle and town. He surrendered the office of Earl Marshal, by which John of Gaunt bought the support of the Lord Percy, one of the Council. Peter de la Mare was committed prisoner to Nottingham Castle. William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, was impeached on eight articles of maladministration, amounting to treason, or misprision of treason.[k] The temporalities of the see were seized into the hands of the King. The Bishop of Winchester was excepted from an act of grace issued on account of the Jubilee, the fiftieth year of the reign of King Edward. At a meeting of the new Parliament, as a further indignity (his temporalities being escheated), no writ was issued to Wykeham as a peer. But he was summoned to Convocation. In Convocation, William Courtenay, Bishop of London, rose and moved that no subsidy should be granted till justice was done to the Bishop of Winchester. The Convocation took the affair up with a high hand. It was an infringement on

July, 1376.

William of Wykeham.

[i] The report, which is very curious and interesting to ecclesiastical antiquaries, is in Fox, i. p. 560.

[k] Lowth, p. 113.

the jurisdiction of Holy Church. The King, or rather the King's Court, treated remonstrance and petition with contempt. The timid Archbishop Whittlesey tried in vain to mediate. The Bishop of Winchester came to his palace in Southwark, and took his seat in Convocation with loud applause. Parliament was dissolved, as well as Convocation, without any reconciliation. The King, under the influence of John of Gaunt, attempted to divert the popular mind by granting the temporalities of Winchester to Richard of Bourdeaux, now Prince of Wales and proclaimed heir-apparent to the Crown. Feb. 23. About March 2.

But before the death of Edward, almost his last act,[m] whether to propitiate Heaven, or still but as a passive instrument in the hands of others, was the restitution of these temporalities to the Bishop of Winchester.[n] It was under a condition which shows the vast opulence of that Prelate. He was to furnish three ships of war, with fifty men-at-arms and fifty archers for a quarter of a year, at the wages paid by the King; if the expedition was not undertaken, the amount which this army would cost.[o] Death of Edward.

Wycliffe, exactly at this time, between the dissolution of the last Parliament and the death of the King, appears summoned to answer at St. Paul's before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, for opinions deserving ecclesiastical censure. Of the specific charges on this occasion nothing is known; though they may be conjectured from those submitted to the Pope, and afterwards brought against him by the Papal mandate. Wycliffe stood before the tribunal, but not alone. He was accompanied by John of Gaunt and the Lord Percy, now Earl Marshal. There was an immense throng to witness this exciting spectacle; Wycliffe could not make his way through. The Earl Marshal assumed the authority of his office to compel the crowd to recede. The Bishop of London, no doubt indignant at the unlooked for appearance of the Nobles, resented this exercise Wycliffe at St. Paul's.

[m] June 18. King Edward died June 21.

[n] Dr. Lingard says (note) that he made a valuable present to Alice Perrers.

[o] Lowth, p. 146.

of the Earl Marshal's power in his church. He haughtily declared that if he had known how Percy would act, he would have inhibited his entrance into the Cathedral. The Duke of Lancaster in his pride rejoined that, despite the Bishop, the Earl Marshal would use the authority necessary to maintain order. They reached with difficulty the Court in the Lady Chapel. The Earl Marshal demanded a seat for Wycliffe. "He had many things to answer, he needed a soft seat." "It is contrary," answered Courtenay, "to law and reason that one cited before his Ordinary should be seated." Fierce words ensued between the Earl Marshal and the Bishop. The Duke of Lancaster taunted the family pride of Courtenay. The Bishop replied with specious humility, "that he trusted not in man, but in God alone, who would give him boldness to speak the truth." Lancaster was overheard, or thought to be overheard, as if he threatened to drag the Bishop out of the church by the hair of his head. The populace were inflamed by the insult to the Bishop, the insult to the City of London. The privileges of the City were supposed to be menaced by the Earl Marshal's assumption of authority within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor.[p] A wild tumult began. The proceedings were broken up: Wycliffe, who all along had stood silent, retired. Lancaster and the Earl Marshal had doubtless sufficient force to protect their persons. But throughout the City the populace arose; they attacked John of Gaunt's magnificent palace, the Savoy; his arms were reversed like those of a traitor. The palace, but for the Bishop of London, would have been burned down. A luckless clergyman, mistaken for the Earl Marshal, was brutally murdered. The Duke fled to Kennington, where the Princess of Wales was residing with her young son. The rioters were appeased by a message from the Princess: but they demanded that the Bishop of Winchester and Peter de la Mare should have their fair and immediate inquest before their peers, according to the laws of the

[p] Lancaster was afterwards accused of a design to abolish the Lord Mayor, and to appoint a captain under the Crown; and that the Earl Marshal's power should be current in the City as in other parts of the kingdom. Lancaster did turn out the Lord Mayor and Aldermen and appoint others.

land. It is difficult not to trace some latent though obscure connection between the persecution of William of Wykeham and the proceedings against John Wycliffe.[q] It was the inevitable collision between the old and the new opinions. Wykeham, the splendid, munificent, in character blameless Prelate, was wise enough to devote his vast riches to the promotion of learning, and by the foundation of noble colleges, was striving to continue the spell of the hierarchical power over the human mind. Wycliffe, seeing the more common abuse of that wealth by Prelates of baser and more sordid worldliness, sought the interests of Christ's religion in the depression, in the abrogation, of the mediæval hierarchy. The religious annals of England may well be proud of both.

The accession of Richard II. shook the overweening power of John of Gaunt. The first act under the new reign was the full and ample pardon of Wykeham, hurried through, under the Privy Seal, with the utmost despatch. Peter de la Mare was released from Nottingham Castle; Lancaster condescended to pay humble court to the City of London. Henceforth, John of Gaunt is the less avowed and open supporter of Wycliffe. If, indeed, John of Gaunt had any real love of Christian liberty and truth, he had greater love of power. Yet on the accession of Richard appears the same conflict of opinions as under the Good Parliament. The King's Ministers and his Parliament looked with greedy eyes on a considerable treasure levied on the realm, which they knew to be in the hands of the Pope's agents or bankers. They determined to seize it and appropriate it to the public service. But they were desirous to obtain legal sanction for this course. It is probable that among the authorities to which they appealed was the University of Oxford. It was either the function, or imposed on Wycliffe by the University, or he was chosen at the suggestion of the Crown, well knowing the bias of his opinions, to frame the answer. In that answer, as might be expected, he declared boldly that the necessities of the nation have the first and paramount claim to all moneys raised within the realm. He sheltered himself with much

[q] Lewis, p. 81. Stowe's Chronicle.

ingenuity under the all-venerated name of St. Bernard, and was not sorry to have the opportunity of publicly proclaiming the opinion of that Saint, that Eugenius III. could pretend to no secular dominion as the successor of St. Peter.[r]

Pope orders proceedings against Wycliffe.

Information during this interval had been laid at Avignon against the opinions of Wycliffe. The Pope, Gregory XI., despatched his Bulls to England: three addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury Simon of Sudbury and other Bishops; one to the King; one to the University of Oxford, commanding inquiry into the erroneous doctrines of Wycliffe. The Prelates are to investigate the truth of the allegations; if true to commit to gaol and obtain the confession of Wycliffe, and to transmit the same to Rome. Should they not be able to apprehend him, they are to cite him to appear before the Pope. The King is exhorted to render all assistance to the aforesaid Prelates. The University of Oxford is commanded to prohibit the teaching any of the doctrines promulgated by Wycliffe in his detestable madness, to apprehend him and to deliver him to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. The University treated the Bull hardly with cold respect; they debated whether they should receive it: so far they condescended, but for the execution of its mandate they took no measures whatever. The opinions charged against Wycliffe were entirely against the ecclesiastical power, as yet he is not accused of departing from the creed of the Church: they are the opinions of Marsilius of Padua and John of Gaudun, the defenders of the temporal monarchy against the Pope; they are denounced as subversive of civil as of ecclesiastical authority.

Wycliffe at Lambeth.

The Archbishop, Sudbury, wrote to the Chancellor of Oxford to cite John Wycliffe to appear in the Church of St. Paul to answer for his errors. Wycliffe appeared not at St. Paul's, but at Lambeth. He had no longer Lancaster and the Earl Marshal at his side, but a more formidable array of partisans, the populace. Among these were citizens of London, now that their privileges

[r] Fox, i. 384.

were not threatened, on the side of the Reformer.[s] They forced their way into the chapel; their menacing looks and gestures affrighted the Prelates. In the midst of their alarm arrived Sir Lewis Clifford, in the name of the Princess of Wales, now at the head of the administration, prohibiting the Bishops from any further proceeding against Wycliffe. The indignant historian is bitter upon their weakness. "They were as reeds shaken by the wind, became soft as oil in their speech, to the discredit of their own dignity, and the degradation of the Church. Panic-stricken they were, as men that hear not, as those in whose mouth is no reproof."[t]

Eighteen articles had been exhibited, probably sent from England to the Pope, by the Pope back to England, as the definite charges against the Reformer. Wycliffe drew up three replies to these articles. One he delivered to the Papal Delegates; one more brief was intended, it should seem, for general circulation. The third was in Latin, a fierce recrimination on a nameless assailant, whom he calls the "motley doctor." The first and the more full is calm, cautious, guarded; yet on some of the more momentous questions significant enough. To the first five charges, which turn on subtle and scholastic points (Wycliffe was no contemptible Schoolman), he is subtle and scholastic. In the later articles two great principles transpire without disguise: 1, That the property of the Church is not inalienable, indefeasible, may be forfeited if it be not applied to its proper use, and that it is for the temporal power to enforce that forfeiture; 2, That spiritual powers of censure, excommunication, absolution, are not absolute and unconditional, but depend for their validity, and will be ratified by God, only if uttered or promulgated in strict conformity with the law of God. Wycliffe declares his resolution by God's grace to be a sincere church-

[s] There is a singular instance of the progress of Wycliffe's opinions. The Mayor of London, John of Northampton, like his puritanical successors in later days, to the great disparagement of the clergy, took the morals of the City under his own care. He arrested a number of loose women, cut off their hair, and exposed them to public derision, openly asserting that he was compelled to this act of authority by the remissness of the clergy, who for money would connive at any debauchery, and even sell licenses for incestuous marriages.—Fox, ut supra.

[t] Walsingham.

man, he by no means declines the jurisdiction of the Church; he is prepared to deliver his opinions in writing, he is ready to defend them to death. They are formed from the Sacred Scriptures and from holy doctors; if they are proved adverse to the faith he is ready and willing to retract them.[u] Nothing further was done, beyond an injunction to Wycliffe to keep silence, lest he should mislead the ignorant.

The death of Pope Gregory XI., as it annulled the authority held by the Prelates, estopped all further proceedings. The Schism which followed was not likely to re-establish the awe of the Pope in minds which had either shaken it off, or were ready to shake it off. Wycliffe sent out a tract on the Schism of the Church.

Wycliffite Teachers.

Wycliffe is now the head of a sect; he becomes more and more the antagonist of the hierarchy; as yet only of the higher and wealthier dignitaries, more immediately threatened by his democratic views as to their temporalities; and of the more sagacious divines, who might discern how rapidly and how far such a mind, once released from the yoke of the ancient theology, would break loose from the established opinions. He appears not as yet to be an object of alarm or unpopularity with the lower clergy; Oxford has not repudiated him. But he is now organising a kind of Order of his own, who travel through the land, preaching, where favoured by the clergy, in the churches, elsewhere in the highways and market-places. These itinerant teachers vied with and supplanted the Mendicant Orders in popularity. How they were maintained appears not; probably they were content with hospitable entertainment, with food and lodging. Such was the distinction drawn by Wycliffe between our Lord and his Apostles and the sturdy beggars whom he anathematised, and whose mode of exaction is so humorously described by Chaucer. There is always a depth of latent religiousness in the heart of the common people, and these

[u] Dr. Lingard and Dr. Vaughan differ as to the time of publication of these writings. It appears to me that there is no certain evidence on the point; nor is it material. The more violent was a polemic and personal tract; the other a calm and deliberate reply before a public judicature. I see no evasion or timidity, nothing beyond ordinary discretion, in Wycliffe's conduct.

men spoke with simplicity and earnestness the plainer truths of the Gospel in the vernacular tongue. The novelty, and no doubt, the bold attacks on the clergy, as well as the awfulness of the truths now first presented in their naked form of words, shook, thrilled, enthralled the souls of men, most of whom were entirely without instruction, the best content with the symbolic teaching of the ritual.

Wycliffe has now begun at least his great work, the Complete English Version of the Scriptures, and as this work proceeds, it more entirely engrosses his mind, and assumes its place as the sole authority for religious belief. It must have been sent out and widely promulgated in different portions, or it could not, before the days of printing, have become so familiar to the popular mind as to give ground to the bitter complaint of one of Wycliffe's adversaries, that laymen and women who could read were better acquainted with the Scripture than the most lettered and intelligent of the Clergy.[x] Translation of Scripture.

But as Wycliffe advanced in more exclusive devotion to the Sacred Writings, as by his own work of translation, and the translations of his coadjutors, he became more fully acquainted with the Bible, he began to question not only the power of the Pope and of the Hierarchy, but some of the doctrines of the Church. He is now examining and rejecting with deliberate determination the materialism of the vulgar Transubstantiation. He is become not merely a dreaded and dangerous Reformer, but, according to the dominant creed, a daring and detested heresiarch. It might almost seem that Rome was in the conspiracy against her own power and sacred authority. "This very year," writes Walsingham (a high Papalist, who not the less dwells with honest energy on the venality of the Court of Rome), "came the Cardinal di S. Prassede into England, to treat of the marriage of the Emperor's sister with the King, and to drain the realm of its wealth. The whole kingdom poured out to him, for there was no

[x] "Unde per ipsum fit vulgare et magis apertum, laicis et mulieribus legere scientibus, quam solet esse clericis admodum literatis et bene intelligentibus."—Knighton, p. 2644.

grace which he would not sell, none which he would grant without money: he sold indulgences, formerly reserved by the Pope to himself, for two years, for three years, excommunications, absolutions, commutations for pilgrimages. At length, his men grew wanton in their avarice; they disdained silver, would take nothing but gold: he carried off in his bags more than a year's taxes of the realm." [y]

At this time also broke out the insurrection of the Commons: six counties at least—Kent, Essex, Hertford, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge—were in furious revolt. Wat Tyler and his rude Kentish peasantry were in possession of London. Among other noble victims, the Archbishop of Canterbury had been cruelly put to death on Tower Hill.[z] The resolution of the young King, the boldness of Walworth the Mayor of London, seem to have saved the whole realm from anarchy, the upper orders from massacre and ruin. This outburst had no connection with religion. It was a political and social insurrection; it had its immediate origin in a heavy all-burthening tax, levied in a manner to awaken all the most ardent and generous feelings of the people. Men have borne every oppression, but have been maddened beyond control by insults to their wives and daughters. The popular fury was not against the sacerdotal order: it was against the judges, the lawyers, the jurymen. They did not doom to ruin the churches or the monasteries, but the courts of law: they would destroy all the archives of the realm, probably esteeming them mere rolls and records of taxation. The Duke of Lancaster was the special object of hatred—Lancaster the patron of Wycliffe. They burned his splendid palace in the Savoy. It was not as Archbishop, but as Chancellor, that they murdered Simon of Sudbury, as one who had called them "shoeless ribalds," and urged no concession. They beheaded him as a false traitor to the

[y] Walsingham, p. 246.

[z] The Monk of St. Denys was in London at this time. "Michi causam Ecclesiæ nostre in hoc regno promoventi (had S. Denys still property in England?) cum indignanter audirem ipsa die per ville bivia illius Archiepiscopi capud sacratum plebem pedibus huc illucque projecisse, unusque assistentium diceret, Scias in regno Franciæ abhominabiliora futura et in brevi, hoc solum subjunxi, absit ut Galliæ continuata fidelitas tanto monstro deformetur." This is a singular illustration of the public feeling. —P. 134.

Commons and to the realm.[a] At St. Albans, at Edmondsbury, at Walsingham, it was the villains demanding manumission from their lords, not Wycliffe's disciples despoiling possessioners. Not indeed that such insurrectionists were likely to look with much respect on the exorbitant wealth of the clergy. Some proclaimed that no taxes were to be paid till the whole Church property was confiscated and expended.[b]

No popular insurrection, in truth, can take place without stirring up all the dregs of society; all the turbulent, the designing, the political and religious fanatics are then in their element. Among the first acts of the rebels was to break open the gaols. From the prison of the Archbishop of Canterbury came forth John Ball, who, years before Wycliffe had been heard of, had promulgated among the humblest classes the wildest levelling doctrines. He was a religious demagogue of the lowest order; his tenets are contained in the old popular rhyme, "When Adam delved and Eve span, Who was then the gentleman?" He had been seized and imprisoned; imprisonment was not likely to soften his fierce temper. His release by a violent and victorious mob of peasants would offer too tempting opportunities for vengeance on his persecutors,[c] and stimulate and seem to justify the propagation of his tenets to the utmost.[d] Nor was John Ball alone; there were others who mingled up doctrines of social and religious anarchy. The confession of Jack Straw is that of one of the Fraticelli. He looked forward to the glorious time when the Mendicants should possess the whole earth.[e] Walsingham accuses the Mendicants as one of the great causes of the insurrection. Jack Straw's confession was obtained by the Lord Mayor of London, who promised not pardon, but

[a] Knighton. Read the account of Sudbury's death in Godwin. He was a man of great eloquence, and died, it is said, imploring pardon on his enemies.

[b] Walsingham. He was a monk of St. Albans. His account of the revolt against the abbot is prolix and curious.

[c] Knighton says that some proposed to make John Ball their Archbishop of Canterbury. Was John Ball present at the beheading of Sudbury, and so wreaking vengeance for his imprisonment? Compare the account of John Ball in Lewis, p. 223, &c.

[d] There is an inhibition by Archbishop Islip against the Mendicants, issued at the same time with that against John Ball.—Wilkins, iii. 64, 5, A.D. 1366. There is another denunciation of John Ball by Archbishop Sudbury, April 21, 1381.

[e] "Soli Mendicantes vixissent in terrâ."

to pay for masses for his soul: he was joined in this posthumous benevolence by other charitable citizens.

This insurrection, nevertheless, had two fatal consequences to Wycliffe and to his tenets. All reformers, even the wisest and most moderate, must make up their minds to bear the odium of the exaggeration of their own opinions. No religious or social innovation can be without its danger. It is the one profound and difficult question whether mankind is to linger on in any depth of darkness, ignorance, oppression, rather than undergo that danger. Wycliffe's enemies of course denounced John Ball as his partisan.[f] Between the two men there was no connection, less sympathy. With Wycliffe religion was the sole, exclusive, ultimate aim; with the wilder insurgent teachers the religious was but one part of a wide, universal, social, political revolution. But those to whom all innovation is dangerous, naturally and without dishonesty refuse to discriminate between the darker and lighter shades, the anarchic and the Christian points, in the destructive doctrines which threaten their power, influence, interest, rank, authority. To them every opponent in religious matters is a blasphemer, a heretic; in civil, a demagogue and an anarchist.

Effects on Wycliffe.

But it was not this general suspicion and jealousy alone which darkened the minds of the clergy, and wrought them up to keener vigilance against the doctrines of Wycliffe. To the murdered Simon Sudbury, who seems to have been more gentle and moderate in his ecclesiastic rule,[g] succeeded the high-born and High-Church Prelate, William Courtenay, before whom Wycliffe had already twice appeared, and twice defied or escaped prosecution. Courtenay, with the indignation and terror excited by the terrible sight of his predecessor's headless trunk, was least likely to draw these just, no doubt, but not clearly discernible distinctions between the opponents of authority. With his birth, education, position, haughty temper, all-

Courtenay Archbishop.

[f] Compare Lewis, p. 221. The good sense of his observations is marred by his coarse language.

[g] Sudbury appears to have been tardy and irresolute, if not unwilling, in his prosecution of Wycliffe and his doctrines. His death was by some attributed to his guilty laxity in this prosecution.

resistance to ecclesiastical superiority, was rebellion, sacrilege, impiety. The first act of Courtenay was to summon a Synod to deliberate and determine on the measures to be taken concerning certain strange and dangerous opinions widely prevalent, as well among the Nobility as among the Commons of the realm. The Synod met (a dire and significant omen), not at St. Paul's or Lambeth, but at the Grey Friars (Mendicants) in London. There assembled eight Bishops, fourteen Doctors of Civil and Canon Law, six Bachelors of Divinity, four Monks, fifteen Mendicants (three of these Dominicans, four Minorites, four Augustinians, four Carmelites).[h] Hardly had the Synod taken its seat, when an earthquake shook the Metropolis.[i] The affrighted Synod trembled at this protest of Heaven at their proceedings. Courtenay, with no less promptitude than courage, turned it to a favourable prognostic. "The earth was throwing off its noxious vapours, that the Church might appear in her perfect purity." Twenty-four articles were gathered out of the writings of Wycliffe, ten condemned after three days' debate as heretical, the rest as erroneous. Among the heretical tenets were the denial of Transubstantiation; the assertion that the Sacraments administered by a priest in mortal sin were null; rejection of all confession but to God; a reprobate Pope had no spiritual power, only that conferred by Cæsar; there was no lawful Pope after Urban VI.; all Churches were to live like the Greeks, under their own laws; ecclesiastics were not to hold temporal possessions. One tenet ascribed to Wycliffe was that God ought to obey the devil![k] The erroneous doctrines from which, with some specious loyalty, it was dexterously endeavoured to show Wycliffe an enemy to temporal as to ecclesiastical authority, were: that a Prelate who excommunicated a person whom he didnot know to be really excommunicate, was himself excommunicate; that it is treason to God and the King to excommunicate a person who has appealed to the King; that those who cease to preach, because excommunicated by priests, are

[h] See the names in Fox, p. 568.

[i] Wycliffe himself compared this earthquake to that at the time of the Crucifixion. Confessio, apud Vaughan, ii. vii. Appendix.

[k] Article VII. Lewis, ch. vi. p. 107, 9. Wilkins, Concilia, iii. p. 157.

excommunicate, and liable to answer in the Day of Judgement; that a Lord is no Lord, a Prelate no Prelate, while in mortal sin; that temporal Lords might take away temporal goods from delinquent ecclesiastics, and the people might aid in this; that tithes are alms to be granted to whom we will. The last article condemns altogether the religious Orders, especially the Mendicants: "He who gives alms to a Mendicant is excommunicate."

Archbishop Courtenay determined to give these decrees the most imposing solemnity. A great procession of clergy and laity walked barefoot to St. Paul's to hear a sermon by a Carmelite Friar. Strong measures were taken to suppress the Preachers. An act was passed by the Lords, and promulgated by the King (the first statute of heresy passed in the realm), commanding the apprehension of all the Preachers, with their maintainers and abettors, and their committal to prison, that they might answer in the Bishops' Courts. But Oxford was still the centre of Wycliffe's influence. A Carmelite, Peter Stokes, no doubt esteemed the most eloquent preacher, was sent down to confute the new opinions. Peter Stokes preached in an empty church, while the scholars crowded around the University pulpit, where Nicolas Hereford the Vice-Chancellor, and Philip Rypington, openly maintained the doctrines of Wycliffe. The Chancellor, Peter Rigge, notoriously, if not openly, favoured his cause. He answered the Archbishop's mandate to search the Colleges and Halls, and to force all who held such opinions to retract, that it was as much as his life was worth. "Is then the University," answered Courtenay, "such a fautor of heresy that Catholic truths cannot be asserted in her walls?"[m] Courtenay assumed the office and title of Grand Inquisitor. The Synod met again. The Chancellor, Peter Rigge, and Brightwell, a Doctor of Divinity, appeared.[n] Nicolas Hereford and Philip Rypington were compelled or permitted to recant,[o] but their recantation was held evasive

[m] Lewis, p. 115. Documents, No. 34.

[n] Rigge and Brightwell before the Synod at Lambeth, June 12.

[o] Another Synod, June 18. Here Hereford and Rypington demand, Ashton refuses, delay. They sent in their answers June 20. These were declared insufficient, heretical, deceptive. They were excommunicated July 13. Same day was issued the King's Edict to Oxford.

and unsatisfactory. They were publicly excommunicated at St. Paul's. They fled to implore the protection of the Duke of Lancaster. John of Gaunt coldly recommended them to submit to their superiors. Rypington afterwards absolutely disowned Wycliffe and his tenets. His apostasy was rewarded by the Bishopric of Lincoln. He became, like most apostates, a violent persecutor of his old opinions. He died a Cardinal. Nicolas Hereford is said boldly to have gone to Rome to defend the opinions of Wycliffe; there he was imprisoned, and died a monk.[p] Wycliffe himself appears neither at Oxford nor at Lambeth. He is cited, but no notice is taken of his contumacy. Perhaps he was suffering under his first attack of palsy, expected to be mortal: he was believed indeed to be at the point of death. "I shall not die," he said, "but live and declare the works of the Friars."

In a few months he is not only denouncing the Council of the Grey Friars in London, and haughtily casting back the calumny that he taught "God should obey the devil;" he proceeds to a bolder measure. He presents a petition to the King and Parliament that he may assert and maintain the articles contained in his writings, and proved by authority and reason to be the Christian faith; that all persons, now bound by vows of religion, may follow, instead thereof, the more perfect law of Christ; that tithes be bestowed, according to their proper use, for the maintenance of the poor; that Christ's own doctrine of the Eucharist be publicly taught; that neither King nor kingdom obey any See or Prelate further than their obedience be grounded on Scripture; that no money be sent out of the realm to the Court of Rome or of Avignon, unless proved by Scripture to be due; that no Cardinal or foreigner hold preferment in England; that if a Bishop or Curate be notoriously guilty of contempt of God, the King should confiscate his temporalities; that no Bishop or Curate should be enslaved to secular office; that no one should be imprisoned on account of excommunication.[q]

[p] Yet he appears, if there is not some mistake or confusion, to have assented at Hereford to the persecution of Walter Brute. Compare the whole article on Hereford, as well as on Rypington and Ashton.—Lewis, p. 267, &c.

[q] The petition may be read in its main articles in Vaughan, ii. 97. It was printed by Dr. James, 1608.

Danger seemed to be gathering around Wycliffe, but Wycliffe shrunk not from danger. The Parliament was summoned to Oxford; the Convocation, as of course, accompanied the Session of Parliament; a collision of mortal strife seemed inevitable. The Duke of Lancaster, though Wycliffite in all that concerned the limitation of the power and wealth of the hierarchy, urged the Reformer to submit to his spiritual superiors in matters purely spiritual. Convocation was afraid to stir those questions which concerned the wealth of the hierarchy, the Papal taxation, and other Papal privileges. Parliament respected the exclusive right of Convocation to judge on points of doctrine. Wycliffe was called to answer, but, as it were by common consent, on one doctrine alone—that of the Eucharist.

Nov. 19, 1382.

Wycliffe, at Lutterworth and in the villages around, before the people, was the plain, bold, vernacular preacher; at Oxford, before the Convocation, he was a school divine of acuteness, subtlety, and logical versatility, in which he was perhaps the greatest and most experienced master in the University. We may imagine that among the Prelates, the high-born Primate, the Bishops of London, Norwich, Worcester, Lincoln, Sarum, Hereford, the Chancellor of the University, a host of Doctors, though some may have been, few were men of profound learning. The greater number must have found themselves fairly caught in the meshes of Wycliffe's metaphysic web; at one moment catching words which sounded like the most rigid orthodoxy, at another trembling at nice distinctions which seemed to threaten the most fatal consequences. So completely does Wycliffe seem to have perplexed and bewildered his auditory, that of the monastic historians one boasts of his speech as a humble recantation; one as a bold confutation of the Doctors of the Second Millenary period of the Church, of all who had taught, after Transubstantiation, in its most materialistic form, had become a doctrine of the Church; as an assertion of the tenets of Berengar of Tours.[r] Nor can Wycliffe himself be fairly charged with insincerity, disingenuousness, or even politic art.

[r] Knighton. Walsingham, p. 283.

His view of the Eucharist is singularly consistent, as much so as may be on so abstruse a subject. He is throughout labouring to reconcile a Real Presence with the rejection of the grosser Transubstantiation. The Eucharist is Christ's Body and Blood spiritually, sacramentally; but the bread and wine are not annihilated by transmutation. They coexist, though to the mind of the believer the elements are virtually the veritable Body and Blood of the Redeemer.[s]

That he was condemned by such a Court was matter of course. The condemnation was publicly promulgated in the school of the Augustinian Monks. Wycliffe was sitting in his chair as Professor, and holding, in academic phrase, his Determinations[t] on the other side. He is said to have been confounded by his condemnation. He might well be somewhat appalled: all his followers—even Ashton, who till now had adhered to him—had been reconciled or consented to reconciliation.[u] Lancaster advised submission. But he soon resumed his intrepidity; he appealed, to their indignation, not to the spiritual, but to the temporal authority; not to the Pope but to the King.[x] Lancaster in vain urged him to yield; he refused with calm pertinacity: "On this point all have erred but Berengarius."

Wycliffe at Lutterworth.

Wycliffe retired unmolested to Lutterworth: no one can doubt that he would have shown the dauntlessness of a martyr. But there was as yet no statute in England for the burning of heretics: no officer, without legal warrant, would have obeyed, as in other countries, the mandate of the Church. His adversaries were too wise or too timid to urge extreme measures, such as imprisonment. It is extremely doubtful whether Lancaster and the Parliament would have consented to any act of rigour, and the Primate would not unnecessarily

[s] Apud Vaughan, Appendix, vols. ii. vi. and vii. Wycliffe asserts that a third part of the Clergy believed with him, and would die for their belief.

[t] "Tota prædicta condemnatio promulgata est publicè in scholis Augustiniensium, ipso sedente in cathedrâ, et determinante contrarium. Sed confusus est auditâ condemnatione." From the official report, Wilkins, iii. 176.

[u] Rypingtou was reconciled Oct. 30; Ashton, Dec. 27; Laurence Bedeman, earlier.

[x] "Volens per hoc se protegere regali potestate quod non premeretur vel ecclesiasticâ potestate." In the report of the twelve judges appointed to examine into his opinions, he is said to have apppealed "ad seculare brachium." They compare him to Arius. Peter Stokes, the Carmelite, had now become involved in heresy.

submit to the refusal of the secular power to execute his warrant. His own person had not been safe. Perhaps there was a tacit understanding that Wycliffe should leave Oxford, the most dangerous field of his influence.

In the two years' interval between the appearance of Wycliffe before the Convocation in Oxford and his death, an event occurred not likely with the thoughtful, or with those whose reverence for the Pope and the hierarchy was already shaken, to impair the cause of the Reformers. If the followers of Wycliffe gradually surrendered themselves to a fanatic madness, and became more and more daringly and insultingly hostile to the Clergy, the Clergy might seem under a judicial determination to justify those worst extravagances of hatred.

Crusade of Pope against Pope.

Just at the time when the Schism had shaken the Papacy to its base, and Wycliffe had denounced both Popes alike as Antichrist,[y] and had found strong sympathy in the hearts and minds of men; when the malappropriation of the vast revenues of the Church, which were asserted to be the patrimony of the poor, had been declared in many quarters to demand their confiscation for the public good; when the people had been abused by the fond but captivating notion that by such measures they might be relieved for ever from the burthen of taxation; when motions were entertained in the English Parliament to expel churchmen even from the more peaceful functions in the state; and, indeed, in some quarters notions of the unlawfulness of war were beginning to dawn: for the first time a holy civil war is proclaimed in Christendom, especially in England, the seat of these new opinions; a war of Pope against Pope. The Pontiff of Rome promulgates a crusade against the Pontiff of Avignon. A Bishop (Norwich) is at the head of the English host. Public prayers are put up, by order of the Primate, in every church of the realm, for the success of the expedition into Flanders. The Bishops and the Clergy are called on by the Archbishop to enforce upon their flocks the duty of contribution to this sacred purpose. Money, jewels, property of all kinds, are lavishly brought

[y] Wycliffe was more inclined to Urban VI.—See Lewis, p. 120, note.

in, or rigidly extorted; it is declared meritorious to fight for the faith, glorious to combat for the Lord. The same indulgences are granted as to Crusaders to the Holy Land.[1]

Spencer, the young and martial Bishop of Norwich, had distinguished himself during the peasant insurrection in Norfolk. At the head of eight lances and a few archers, he had boldly arrested one of the ringleaders. A few knights gathered round him. Armed from head to foot, with a huge two-handed sword, he attacked an immense rabble, hewed them down, put the rest to flight, seized the captain, a dyer of Norwich, and reduced his diocese to peace by these victories, and by remorseless executions. This same Bishop set himself at the head of the crusade. The powers entrusted to him by the Pope were enormous: he had full Papal authority. He addressed all the parish priests in the province of York, urging them to compel contributions by every means, by confessions, by indulgences. Parliament murmured that such a vast array of the king's forces should be sent out of the realm under so inexperienced a general: but Hugh Calverly, and some of the old soldiers of the French wars, scrupled not to serve under the mitred captain.[2]

But after all, the issue of the expedition, at first successful, was in the end as shameful and disastrous as it was insulting to all sound religious feeling. The crusaders took Gravelines, they took Dunkirk; and this army of the Pope, headed by a Christian Bishop, in a war so-called religious, surpassed the ordinary inhumanity of the times. Men, women, and children, were hewn to pieces in one vast massacre. After these first successes the London apprentices, and the villains throughout the kingdom, were seized with a crusading ardour. They mounted white cloaks, with red crosses on their shoulders, red scabbards

[1] "The preamble to the Archbishop's mandate for public prayers throughout the realm begins with "Rex pacificus, Jesus Christus." It enlarges on the blessings of peace, and goes on: "Quam meritorium sit pugnare pro fide; quamque decorum pugnare pro Domino." Courtenay's own words!

[2] See in the Close Rolls (edited by Mr. Devon) the issue of money for Spencer's crusade by the hands of John Philpot, for wages in the war, and reward for 2500 men-at-arms and 2500 archers, 6266*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*—9th year of Richard II., 1385.

to their swords, and marched off defying their masters.[b] Many religious, monks and friars, followed their example.[c] The crusaders had neither the pride nor consolation of permanent success. The army of Spencer returned as ingloriously as it had conducted itself atrociously. He had 60,000 men, besides auxiliaries from Ghent. Before Ypres he failed shamefully. At the first approach of the French army he withdrew to Gravelines, and was glad to buy a safe retreat by the surrender of the town.[d]

On Innocents' Day, two years after the condemnation at Oxford, during the celebration of the Mass in the church of Lutterworth, Wycliffe was struck again with paralysis. He died on the last day of the year. In the suddenness of his death, in the day of his death, in the fearful distortions which usually accompany that kind of death, nothing was lost upon his adversaries, who of course held him to be a victim of Divine wrath. He died, it was said, on the day of St. Silvester: to the memory of that Saint, as the fatal receiver of the donation of Constantine, he had ever been implacably hostile. By another account he died on the day of St. Thomas of Canterbury: he was struck while impiously inveighing against that Martyr of the Church.[e]

Yet Wycliffe, though the object of the bitterest hatred, even in his own day awed his most violent antagonists into something approaching to admiration. His austere exemplary life has defied even calumny: his vigorous, incessant efforts to reduce the whole clergy to primitive poverty, has provoked no retort as to his own pride, self-interest, indulgence, inconsistent with his earnest severity. His industry, even in those laborious days, was astonishing.

[b] John Philpot, the magnificent Mayor of London, had raised 1000 men-at-arms at his own expense. He took great interest in the Bishop's expedition, and kept ships to give these volunteers free passage.

[c] Of these religious, says Walsingham, it was "in magnum personarum suarum dedecus et detrimentum, quia non propter Jesum Christum peregrinare decreverant, sed ut patriam mundumque videant."—P. 301.

[d] At a later period, when the Lollards, by preaching against pilgrimages, endangered the interests of our Lady of Walsingham, Bishop Spencer swore that if any of Wycliffe's preachers came into his diocese, he would burn or behead him. "Faith and religion remained inviolate in the diocese of Norwich."—Walsingham, 341.

[e] Walsingham, p. 312. The historian consigns him to the companionship of Cain.

The number of his books, mostly indeed brief tracts, baffles calculation. Two hundred are said to have been burned in Bohemia. How much of the translation of the Scripture he executed himself, is not precisely known; but even if in parts only superintended, it was a prodigious achievement for one man, so deeply involved as he was in polemic warfare with the hierarchy, the monks, and the Mendicant Orders.[f] He was acknowledged to be a consummate master in the dialectics of the Schools: he was the pride, as well as the terror of Oxford. "He was second to none," so writes a monk, "in philosophy; in the discipline of the Schools, incomparable."[g] In this, indeed, appear at once his strength, and the source of the apparent contradictions in the style and matter of his writings. Wycliffe was a subtle schoolman, and a popular religious pamphleteer. He addressed the students of the University in the language and in the logic of their schools; he addressed the vulgar, which included no doubt the whole laity and a vast number of the parochial clergy, in the simplest and most homely vernacular phrase. Hence he is, as it were, two writers: his Latin is dry, argumentative, syllogistic, abstruse, obscure: his English rude, coarse, but clear, emphatic, brief, vehement; with short stinging sentences, and perpetual hard antithesis.[i]

His life shows that his religious views were progressive. His ideal was the restoration of the pure moral and religious supremacy to religion. This was the secret, the vital principle of his anti-sacerdotalism, of his pertinacious enmity to the whole hierarchical system of his day. That the caste of the Clergy was then discharging its lofty moral and religious mission, was denied by every pure and holy mind of the time; the charge was admitted by all the wise, even by Councils. The cause of all this evil, Wycliffe, like many others, saw in their exorbitant wealth. He could not but contrast with the primitive poverty of Christ and his Apostles, that wealth, whether in estates held by

[f] The most curious charge against the translators of the Bible is that it was the Eternal Gospel of Joachim and John Peter Oliva which they were publishing. Was this ignorance or malice?

[g] Knighton.

[i] See, for instance, the long passage in the tract "Antichrist and his Meynie," published by Dr. Todd of Dublin.

those whom he called "possessioners," the tithes exacted from the whole realm, and all which was extorted chiefly in kind by the sturdy beggars among the Mendicants. The Clergy had a right to a frugal, hospitable maintenance, but no more. This wealth was at once held by a false tenure, being the patrimony of the poor, and was forfeited by misuse, and by the neglect and non-performance of the conditions on which it was held. It was therefore not merely lawful, it was the bounden duty of the State, of the King, or the Emperor, to confiscate the whole of these escheated riches; it was the duty of every one to refuse tithe to a priest, who, according to his notions, did not discharge his duty (Wycliffe could not or would not see the wide field he opened, by investing fallible and interested men with this judgement, to avarice and bad passions). It was a sin, a sin deserving excommunication, to contribute to the rapacious quests of the Mendicants.

Wycliffe is charged with holding and urging in the broadest and most comprehensive form, what is called the doctrine of dominion founded in grace; that is, that the possession of anything whatever, even of a wife, depended on the state of grace in which a man might be. Wycliffe no doubt maintained in theory, that all the gifts of God (God, as it were, the One great feudal Suzerain), and of Christ, on account of his original righteousness,[k] were held on the condition of holiness. But I have never read, nor seen adduced, any sentence of his writings, in which he urges the application or enforcement of this principle. He recognizes civil possession as something totally distinct, as a full and legal right. This notion of dominion is diametrically opposed to all his arguments for the right to the resumption of ecclesiastical property by the State.[m] But the ecclesiastics, to whose possessions, as held by sinful and unworthy men, Wycliffe remorselessly applies this rule, had the sagacity to see that this was a logical inference,

[k] So he seems to interpret the "saints shall inherit the earth."

[m] "Titulo autem originalis justitiæ habuit Christus omnia bona mundi, ut sæpe declarat Augustinus, illo titulo, vel titulo gratiæ justorum sunt omnia, *sed longè ab illo titulo* civilis possessio. Unde Christus et sui Apostoli spretâ dominatione civili, fuerunt de habitatione purâ, secundum illum titulum contentati," &c. &c. See the whole curious passage (strangely misprinted) in Vaughan, ii. 235.

an inference which Wycliffe himself may sometimes, in his incautious intrepidity, not always have avoided. They argued upon, refuted, condemned it, as if it were in truth, his favourite, fundamental maxim. A demagogue so dangerous to their order must be made out a demagogue dangerous to all orders. The religious Reformer must be convicted on his own principles, as a political and social anarchist. Nor in their view was this difficult, hardly dishonest. Their property, they averred, was that of God, or at least of his Saints; it boasted a far higher, and a more sacred title than civil possessions: to despoil them was sacrilege, impiety; the spoliation of others only the less heinous crime of robbery: one was an outrage on the divine, the other but a breach of human law.[n]

Wycliffe, after all, was not merely premature as a Reformer of Christianity, he was incomplete and insufficient. He was destructive of the existing system, not reconstructive of a new one. In the translation of the Latin Scripture, and the assertion of the sole authority of Scripture, he had laid the foundation, but he had built on it no new edifice. He had swept away one by one almost all the peculiar tenets of mediæval Latin Christianity, pardons, indulgences, excommunications, absolutions, pilgrimages; he had condemned images, at least of the Persons of the Trinity; he had rejected Transubstantiation. But Teutonic Christianity had to await more than two centuries and a half before it offered a new system of doctrine to the religious necessities of man. Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Calvinism, are forms of faith; from Wycliffism it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to frame a creed like that of Augsburg, Articles like those of the Church of England, or even those of Westminster.

[n] This is among the singular facts, which appear from the refutation by Woodford (apud Brown, Fasciculus), one of the most instructive documents concerning Wycliffism. This was the doctrine also of Armachanus, Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LOLLARDS.

Wycliffe left no heir to his authority or his influence; he had organised no sect. But his opinions, or some of his opinions, had sunk into the hearts of multitudes. Knighton (but Knighton wrote at Leicester in the immediate neighbourhood of Wycliffe) declares, in his bitterness, that every second man you met was a Wycliffite. Under the vague name of Lollards, they were everywhere; bound together by no public, as far as is known by no secret, association; only by common sympathies and common jealousy of the clergy. Many of them no doubt were more, many less, than Wycliffites. They were of all orders, ranks, classes; they were near, and even on, the throne; they were in the baronial castle, in the city among the substantial burghers, in the peasant's hut, even in the monastery. Wycliffe's own personal influence had cast a spell over some of the highest personages in the realm. His doctrines were looked on with favour by the widow of the Black Prince, by John of Gaunt, above all by the Queen of Richard II., Anne of Bohemia. The Good Queen Anne,[a] as she was popularly called, if not in doctrine, in the foundation of her doctrine, reverence for the Scripture, was a Wycliffite. She had the Gospels at least in Bohemian, in English, and in Latin.[b] It was through her

The Lollards.

Anne Queen of Bohemia.

[a] It is an observable indication of popular feeling that "good" seems to be the especial appellative of those most hostile to the Clergy. The "good" Queen Anne; the "good" Parliament, though its popularity rose no doubt much out of its attachment to the Black Prince; the "good" Duke Humphrey, the adversary of Cardinal Beaufort, who had been the most distinguished general in the Anti-Hussite wars. I suspect, too, some latent connection between the Lollard party and Duke Humphrey.

[b] "Nobilis regina Angliæ, soror Cæsaris, habet Evangelium, in linguâ triplici, exaratum, scilicet in linguâ Bohemicâ, Teutonicâ, et Latinâ." I translate "Teutonicâ" English.—Wycliffe, apud Lewis. Anne of Bohemia died 1392.

attendants that grew up not only the political, but the close and intimate religious connection between Bohemia and England. Through them these doctrines passed to John Huss and Jerome of Prague. Not only does the Council of Constance denounce these teachers as disciples of Wycliffe; in repelling and anathematising Wycliffe, it assumes that it is repelling and anathematising the Bohemian Reformers. An Englishman, Peter Payne,[c] throughout the Hussite War, is one of the leaders of religion, one of the great authorities of the Bohemian faith. Among the Wycliffite noblemen the Earl of Salisbury is claimed by Fox, and branded by Walsingham as an obstinate and shameless Lollard, a despiser of images, a scoffer at the Sacraments.[d] His fate will ere long appear. A list of ten or twelve knights of property and influence has been preserved, who openly avowed the Wycliffite opinions: among these was the hero and martyr of Lollardism, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham.[e] London was their stronghold. The sober and wealthy citizens were advancing in intelligence and freedom, jealous no doubt of the riches of the clergy, gained without risk or labour, spent with splendour and ostentation which shamed their more homely and frugal living.[f] Nor were they without active proselytes in the lower and more unruly classes. Peter Patishull, an Augustinian Monk, though appointed one of the Pope's chaplains (a lucrative and honourable office, which conferred great privileges, and was commonly bought at a great price), embraced Wycliffism. He preached publicly on the vices of the clergy, at St. Christopher's in London. The Augustinians burst into the church, and served an interdict on the unsilenced teacher. The Lollards drove them out. Patishull affixed a writing on the doors of St. Paul's, "that he had escaped from the

[c] On Peter Payne, Lewis, p. 229. Compare Palacky, Geschichte von Böhmen, especially iii. 2, p. 485.

[d] "Lolardorum fautor in totâ vitâ, et imaginum vilipensor, contemptor canonum, sacramentorumque derisor."

[e] See ch. x., Lewis's Life of Wycliffe. Sir Thomas Latymer, Sir Lewis Clifforde, Sir John Peeche, Sir Richard Story, Sir Reginald de Hylton, Sir John Trussel, with Dukes and Earls. Lewis is quoting Knighton. Lewis gives an account of these men. To these he adds (p. 242) Sir William Nevyll, Sir John Clenbourn, Sir John Mountague (p. 243), and Sir Laurence de St. Martin (p. 244).

[f] Among Walsingham's reproachful appellations heaped on the Londoners is "Lolardorum sustentatores." Compare Lewis's account of the reforming mayor, John of Northampton, p. 255. He was connected with Chaucer.—*Life of Chaucer*, and Note forward.

companionship of the worst of men to the most perfect and holy life of the Lollards."[g] The midland towns, rising into opulence, were full of Wycliffism, especially Leicester. There the Primate Courtenay took his seat in full Pontificals on the trial of certain heretics, who seem to have been of note; their accusers were the clergy of the town. They were anathematised with bell, book, and candle, and read their recantation.[h] But the strength of the party was in the lower orders of society. Among them the name of Lollard, of uncertain origin (it is doubtful whether it was a name adopted by themselves or affixed as odious and derisive by their enemies[i]), comprehended no doubt, besides the religious, a vast mass of the discontented and revolutionary. In the latter years of his reign the King, Richard II., was hastily summoned from Ireland by the urgent solicitations of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London. An outbreak of the Lollards was said to threaten the peace of the realm. London was placarded with menacing sentences; they were affixed on the doors of St. Paul's and of St. Peter in Westminster. A remonstrance was addressed to the Houses of Parliament. This expostulatory petition showed that the grave and more prudent influence of the master was withdrawn; that his opinions had worked deeply down into a lower region. It does not appear that the more noble or distinguished followers of Wycliffe were concerned in the movement, which was an outburst of popular fanaticism. It was vehemently, in every point, anti-papal, anti-Roman. It was Wycliffite, but beyond Wycliffism. "Since the Church of England, fatally following that of Rome, has been endowed with temporalities, faith, hope, and charity have deserted her communion. Their Priesthood is no Priesthood; men in mortal sin cannot convey the Holy Ghost. The Clergy profess celibacy, but from their pampered living are unable to practise it. The pretended miracle of Transubstantiation leads to idolatry. Exorcisms or Benedictions are vain, delusive, and diabolical. The realm cannot prosper so long as spiritual persons hold

A.D. 1387.

Petition of Lollards.

[g] Fox, i. p. 661, from Chronicle of St. Albans.

[h] Wilkins, iii. 208.

[i] I cannot satisfy myself on this point.

secular offices. One who unites the two is an hermaphrodite. All chantries of prayer for the dead should be suppressed: 100 religious houses would be enough for the spiritual wants of the realm. Pilgrimages, the worshiping images or the Cross, or reliques, is idolatry. Auricular confession, indulgences, are mischievous or a mockery. Capital punishments are to be abolished as contrary to the New Testament. Convents of females are defiled by licentiousness and the worst crimes. All trades which minister to pride or luxury, especially goldsmiths and sword-cutlers, are unlawful."

These murmurs of a burthened and discontented populace were lost in the stir of great political events, the dethronement of the King, his death, and the accession of the Lancasterian dynasty.

The son and successors of John of Gaunt inherited neither the policy nor the religion, if it was the religion, of their ancestor. Henry IV. to strengthen himself on his usurped throne, Henry V. to obtain more lavish subsidies for his French wars, Henry VI. from his meek and pious character, entered into close and intimate alliance with the Church. Religious differences are but faintly traced in the Wars of the Roses. Accession of Henry IV.

The high-born Arundel had succeeded the high-born Courtenay in the See of Canterbury. It is remarkable to see the two Primates, Canterbury and York, on adverse sides in the revolution which dispossessed Richard II. of his throne. Arundel was already, before the landing of Henry at Ravensperg, deep in conspiracy against King Richard. His brother, the Earl of Arundel, had been executed before his face; himself had fled, or had been banished to France. Neville of York adhered to Richard's fortunes, and suffered degradation, or a kind of ignominious translation to St. Andrew's in Scotland.[k] The name, rank, influence, bold character of Arundel contributed more than all other adherents to the usurpation of Henry Bolingbroke. The Archbishop of Canterbury received the abdication of Richard. Scrope, who succeeded Arundel Archbishop, 1397.

[k] The northern prelates seem to have adhered to Richard II. Marks, Bishop of Carlisle, in a speech of singular boldness and force, defended the deposed monarch.—See Collier, i. p. 616. See above reference to Papal Letter, p. 99.

Neville as Archbishop of York, was one of the King's Proctors on his renunciation of the crown. Arundel presented Henry to the people as their king. Arundel set the crown on his brow. When the heads of the Earls of Kent and Salisbury (the famous Lollard) and of six knights, after their vain insurrection and their defeat near Cirencester, were sent to London to be exposed on the bridge, they were received and accompanied by the Bishops and Clergy in solemn procession, in full pontificals, chanting Te Deum.[m] Arundel might seem to have forgotten, in his loyal zeal, that he was the successor of Becket. In that insurrection two clergymen were hanged, drawn, and quartered without remonstrance from the Primate.[n] When Archbishop Scrope, after the revolt of the Percies, is beheaded as a traitor, Arundel keeps silence.

Archbishop Arundel was to be propitiated or rewarded by all concessions which could be demanded by a partisan so unscrupulous and of so much influence. Almost the first act of Henry IV., notwithstanding these bold infringements on the personal sanctity of consecrated persons, was to declare himself the champion of the hierarchy against her dangerous enemies. In the first Convocation a welcome message was delivered, that the new King would be the Protector of the Church. The Prelates were urged to take measures for the suppression of itinerant preachers; the Crown promised its aid and support. The King, in his first speech in Parliament, announced the same deliberate determination to maintain the Catholic faith. The Commons returned their humble thanks for his Majesty's zeal in the assertion of the Catholic faith and the liberties of the Church.

A.D. 1399.

In England alone a Statute was necessary to legalise the

[m] So writes the Monk of St. Denys, as if present. "Aderant et præcedentes, qui capita comitum Cantiæ et de Salisberry, sex quoque aliorum militum, longis lanceis affixa defferebant cum lituis et instrumentis musicis, ut sic cives ad horrendum spectaculum convenirent. Cumque Pontifices cum Clero sacris vestibus induti processionabantur, Te Deum laudamus altis vocibus cantando obviam scelesti (o ?) muneri processissent, tandem ad introitum pontis suspensa sunt capita, membra quoque per campestria sparsa sunt, feris et avibus devoranda."—L. xx. c. 16, p. 738. When the quarters of these unhappy men were brought to London, no less than 18 bishops and 32 mitred abbots joined the populace, and met them with the most indecent marks of joy and exultation. See, too, the conduct of the Earl of Rutland.—Hume, Henry IV.

[n] Walsingham, p. 363.

burning of heretics. In all other parts of Christendom the magistrate had obeyed the summons of the clergy. The Sovereign, either of his own supreme authority, or under the old Roman Imperial Law, had obsequiously executed the mandates of the Bishop. The secular arm received the delinquent against the law of the Church. The judgement was passed in the Ecclesiastical Court or that of the Inquisition; but the Church, with a kind of evasion which it is difficult to clear from hypocrisy, would not be stained with blood. The Clergy commanded, and that under the most awful threats, the fire to be lighted and the victim tied to the stake by others, and acquitted themselves of the cruelty of burning their fellow-creatures.

Statute de Heretico Comburendo.

King Henry IV. and the Parliament (even the Commons, now affrighted no doubt by the wild and revolutionary tenets ascribed to all the Lollards, and avowed by some) enacted the Statute which bears the ill-omened appellation, "for the burning of heretics." The preamble was directed in the most comprehensive terms against the new preachers.° It was averred that in their public preachings, in their schools, through their books, they stirred up and inflamed the people to sedition, insurrection, and other enormities too horrible to be heard, in subversion of the Catholic Faith and the doctrine of Holy Church, in diminution of God's honour, and also in destruction of the estate, rights, and liberties of the Church of England. These preachings, schools, books were strictly inhibited. The Bishop of the diocese was empowered to arrest all persons accused or suspected of these acts, to imprison them, to bring them to trial in his court. "If he shall refuse to abjure such doctrines, or, having abjured, relapse, sentence is to be recorded: a writ issued to the sheriff of the county, the mayor or bailiff of the nearest borough, who is to take order that on a high place in public, before the face of the people, he be burned."

A.D. 1400.

Nor was this Statute an idle menace; the Primate and the Bishops hastened to make examples under its terrible provisions.

° But see Hallam, Middle Ages, ii. p. 221.

William Sautree.

William Sautree is the protomartyr of Wycliffism. But the first victim, while he displays most fully the barbarity of the persecutors, does not lead the holy army with much dignity. His sufferings alone entitle him to profound commiseration. He was chosen perhaps as an example to overawe London, and as one whose fate would not provoke dangerous sympathy. William Sautree had been Priest of St. Margaret's in King's Lynn: he was now a preacher at St. Osyth in the City. He had been already arraigned and convicted before that model of a Christian Prelate, the warlike Bishop of Norwich. On his trial in London, he not only recanted and withdrew his recantation (a more pardonable weakness), he daringly denied that he had ever been on trial before. The record of the Court of Norwich was produced before him. He had already been condemned as a heretic for the denial of Transubstantiation. He was now doomed to the flames, as a relapsed heretic. The ceremony of his degradation took place at St. Paul's, with all its minute, harassing, impressive formalities. He was then delivered over, and for the first time the air of London was darkened by the smoke of this kind of human sacrifice. The writ for the execution of Sautree distinctly stated that the burning of heretics is enjoined by the law of God as well as of man, and by the canons of the Church. The act was that of the King, by the advice of the Lords and Commons. The burning was in abhorrence of the crime, and as an example to all other Christians.[p]

Yet if the Commons had assented (if they did formally assent to the persecuting Statute), if they had petitioned for its rigid enforcement against the Lollards, and those who rejected the Catholic doctrines, there was still great jealousy of the more unpopular abuses in the Church. In the fourth year of Henry petitions were presented,[q] that all Monks of French birth should be expelled from the country, all priories held by foreigners seized, every benefice have its vicar bound to reside, and to exercise hospitality; that no one should be allowed to enter into any of

[p] The account is in Fox. Compare House of Lancaster, p. 35.
[q] Rot. Parliament, iii. 459.

the four Mendicant Orders under the age of 24. The King assented to limit the age to 18.[r] The next session the King, by his Chancellor, as though to awe the boldness of Parliament, again declared it to be his royal will to maintain the Church, as his ancestors had maintained it, in all its liberties and franchises. He compared the realm and its three estates to the human body. The Church was the right side, the King the left, the Commonalty the other members. The answer of the Commons was an address to the King to dismiss his Confessor and two others of his household. Henry not merely submitted, but declared that he would retain no one about his person who had incurred the hatred of his people. Nothing could equal the apparent harmony of the King and his Parliament: he entreated them not to be abashed or to refrain from giving their good counsel. They desired that he would notify to them the honourable and virtuous persons whom he named for his household, and that he would appoint no foreigners. The King again graciously assented: he even promised to live upon his own. "The King is willing so to do, as soon as he well may." But the Commons were well aware of the weakness of Henry's title. So far as that the Commonalty might relieve themselves from taxation by throwing the burthen on the wealth of the Church, they were all Lollards. They represented that while the knights were worn out in service against the King's enemies, the clergy sat idle at home. Primate Arundel answered that their vassals followed the King to his wars; that they paid their tenths more promptly than the laity their fifteenths, besides the potent aid of their prayers. The Speaker (he was a knight, John Cheyne,[s] who had been in deacon's orders, and thrown them off without license) betrayed in his voice and look something of heretical or knightly disparagement of the value of their prayers. Arundel broke out, "No kingdom ever prospered without devotion; nor think

Strife in Parliament.

[r] Walsingham gives a whimsical illustration of the feeling about the Mendicants. He says that Owen Glendower's dealing with devils was instigated and aided by the Friar Minors. But he is shocked at his own words. "Absit ut hominibus tam sanctam professis regulam ut cum dæmonibus tantam contraherent familiaritatem."—P. 366.

[s] Walsingham, p. 572.

thou to plunder the Church; so long as there is an Archbishop of Canterbury, you will do it at your peril." The Primate fell on his knees before the wavering King, imploring him to respect his oaths, and to protect the rights of the Church. The obstinate Commons persisted in their unwelcome representations. They urged from a schedule, with tempting and nicely-calculated particulars, that the temporal possessions of the Bishops, Abbots, Priors, now idly wasted, would furnish to the realm 15 Earls, 1500 Knights, 6200 Squires. The King forbade them to discuss such high matters. They began still more to show their anti-hierarchical spirit. They demanded a mitigation of the statute against the Lollards. The King answered that it ought to be made more severe. But for some unexplained reason a subsequent answer to the same petition was in milder terms, yet "this relaxation was not to be alleged as an example."

A.D. 1407.

In the midst of these significant struggles between the King and the Commons—the King pledged by gratitude and by his interests to maintain the hierarchy to the utmost; the Commons, if not in open assertion of religious liberty, looking with greedy and jealous eyes on the estates of the clergy: the second victim on record of the sanguinary law was sent to public execution. He was but a humble tailor of the diocese of Worcester. Why, among all the Lollards, who boasted that they were 100,000, this poor man was chosen for this melancholy distinction does not appear. John Badbee had already been tried and condemned in the Court of the Bishop of Worcester. His crime was the ordinary one, the denial of Transubstantiation; and this, excepting that in one respect it was coarsely expressed,[1] from the usual objections which formed part of the Wycliffite creed. He was summoned to London before a more dignified and solemn tribunal. The Primate sat, with the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, Norwich, Salisbury, Bath, Bangor, St. David's, Edmund Duke of York, the Chancellor, and the Master of the

March 1, 1409.

Badbee burned.

[1] He said that John Bates of Bristol had as much power and authority to make the like body of Christ as any priest had.—Fox, i. 679.

Rolls. The poor man's answers were given with courage and firmness in words of simplicity and plain sense. He said that he would believe "the Omnipotent God in Trinitie," and said, moreover, "if every Host being consecrated at the altar were the Lord's body, that then there be 20,000 Gods in England. But he believed in one God Omnipotent." Every effort was made to incline him to retract. Arundel the Primate condescended to urge him in the strongest terms to submission. He was condemned in a second great Court, held in St. Paul's. He was brought out to be burned in Smithfield. The Prior of St. Bartholomew's, as if to overawe him, brought out the Sacrament. The Prince of Wales, Henry, chanced to be present. At the first sensation of the fire, the poor man cried out "Mercy!" The Prince ordered the fire to be removed. But it was to the mercy of God, not of man, that Badbee appealed. Neither persuasions nor the promises of a yearly maintenance could subdue his quiet but inflexible courage; he was thrust back into the blazing cask, and perished in the flames. Did Prince Henry turn away his eyes?[u]

William Thorpe, arraigned before this time, was a man of higher station and character. He was tried before Arundel; his trial lasted a considerable time; it almost appears that it was protracted for more than a year. But it is most remarkable that, after all, it is not known what was his fate. He lived to write an account of his trial; it is probable that he was kept in prison.[x]

On the accession of Henry V., the religious conduct of the gay and dissolute Prince might have been an object of apprehension; the Lollards might hope that at least, notwithstanding his doubtful conduct at the execution of Badbee, he would not be the slave of the hierarchy. These apprehensions and these hopes were speedily dissipated, whether by any acts or words of Henry; by the early betrayal of his ambitious designs, into which the sagacious Church afterwards threw itself

Accession of Henry V.

[u] Walsingham as well as Fox relates his death.—P. 379.

[x] This is the conjecture of Fox. The trial is curious. The trial or arraignment began in 1407.

with the most loyal ardour; or from the no less sagacious prescience of his character among the Lollards. The Lollards might well mistrust the son of Henry IV.; and such men, among many of whom fanaticism was the height of virtue, were not likely to disguise their mistrust, or to refrain from taking measures perhaps for their safety, perhaps for more than safety. Whatever the causes of this mutual jealousy, the Lollards seem to have begun the strife. On the doors of the churches in London appeared menacing notices, that to the number of 100,000 men, they were prepared to maintain their opinions by force of arms.

Oldcastle, Lord Cobham.

The head of the Lollards was Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, a man of the highest military reputation, who had served with great distinction in the French wars. His whole soul was now devoted to his religion. Through his influence unlicensed preachers swarmed through the country, especially in the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Hereford. The Primate Arundel was not a man to shrink from bold and decisive measures in his own diocese, or not to force to issue the King's yet undeclared opinions on this momentous question. He summoned the Convocation of the Clergy. Lord Cobham was accused as having spoken contemptuously of the power and authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of holding heretical opinions on the Eucharist, on Penance, Pilgrimages, the Power of the Keys. On these crimes he was denounced to the King. Henry honoured the valiant knight, the skilful general, who had already distinguished himself in the wars of France, who might hereafter (for Henry's ambitious schemes were assuredly within his heart) be of signal service in the same fields. He had no doubt that his own arguments would convince so noble a subject, so brave a soldier, so aspiring a knight. But Henry was just emerged from his merry life; at least, with all mistrust of the potent enchantments of Shakespeare, Henry's youth can have been no school for serious theology. He knew not much of the depth of religious feeling which possessed the disciples of Wycliffe. He resented the more the unexpected resistance of Cobham; his disobedience was

almost treason. Cobham, as it is related, protested the most submissive loyalty. "You I am most prompt and willing to obey: you are a Christian King, the Minister of God, that bears not the sword in vain, for the punishment of wicked doers and the reward of the virtuous. To you, under God, I owe my whole obedience. Whatsoever you command me in the name of the Lord, that am I ready to fulfil. To the Pope I owe neither suit nor service: he is the great Antichrist, the son of perdition, the abomination of desolation in the holy place."

Lord Cobham[z] retired to his strong castle of Cowling, near Rochester. He treated the citations, the excommunications of the Archbishop with utter contempt, and seemed determined to assert the independence of a bold baron, and to defend his house against all aggressors. The summoners, one after another, were repelled; letters citatory affixed on the doors of Rochester Cathedral, three miles off, were torn down and burned. The Summoner at length found his way into the castle accompanied by a King's officer. To the royal officer Cobham was too prudent or too loyal to offer resistance. He was committed to the Tower. There (perhaps shortly before) he published a full confession of his belief. Its language was calm, guarded, conciliatory. If the Clergy had chosen to be satisfied, they might have been satisfied. Cobham was again admitted to the King's presence. He offered one hundred knights as his compurgators. He offered wager of battle; he would fight for life or death with Christian or heathen, on the quarrel of his faith, saving the King and his Counsellors.[a]

But Arundel was determined to crush his antagonist. He admitted that Cobham's confession contained much which was good. Articles were framed declaring Transubstantiation in its grossest form, the absolute annihilation of the material bread and wine; Confession in the most rigid terms, obedience to the hierarchy, the worship of images, and pilgrimages. Cobham was arraigned before the Primate, the Bishops of London and Winchester (the Bishop

[z] He was Lord Cobham by right.
[a] It is said, but most improbably, that he appealed from the Archbishop to the Pope.

of Bangor joined the tribunal), with a number of Doctors of the Canon and Civil Law.[b] The Archbishop's language was mild, his purpose stern and inflexible. Cobham knelt down and spake: "Many have been my crimes against man; for the breaking of God's commandments they never cursed me, for breaking their laws and traditions I and others are thus cruelly entreated." He was committed, and appeared a second time in the Dominican convent. He was submitted to a long, weary, intricate, scholastic cross-examination. He gradually lost his calm self-command. The suppressed enthusiasm burst out into a wild prophetic denunciation of the Pope and the Prelates. He denounced the wealth of the Church as the venom of the Church. "What meanest thou," said Arundel, "by venom?" "Your possessions and your lordships. Then cried an angel in the air, as your own chronicles witness: 'Woe, woe, woe! this day is venom poured into the Church of God.' Since that day Pope hath put down Pope; one has poisoned, one has cursed, one has slain another. Consider ye this, all men. Christ was meek and merciful; the Pope haughty and a tyrant. Christ was poor and forgave; the Pope is rich and a homicide. Rome is the nest of Antichrist: out of that nest come his disciples. The Prelates, the Priests, the Monks are the body; these shaven Friars the tail." "That is uncharitably spoken," said the Prior of the Augustines. The blood of Cobham was on fire; he went on in his fierce declamation. He soon resumed his calm courage, and argued with close precision. After his sentence, he said: "Though ye judge my body, ye have no power over my soul." He knelt and prayed for his enemies. He was condemned, adjudged a heretic, and committed to the Tower.[c]

He made his escape from the Tower, and from that time

[b] During the search for Wycliffe's writings, which were publicly burned at Paul's Cross, a book was found at a limner's, where it had been left to be illuminated, belonging to Oldcastle. The King read a few pages, and declared that he had never read such dangerous doctrines. Oldcastle owned the book to be his property, but asserted that he had read only two or three pages of it, and could not be answerable for its contents.

[c] Fox. The sentence passed by Arundel may be read.

became an object of terror to the government, who dreaded a general rising of the Lollards under a man of such known intrepidity, valour, and science. Rumours of conspiracies, of insurrections, of designs on the person of the King, spread abroad. A royal proclamation, subsequently issued, accused the Lollards of a deliberate, wide-spread plot to destroy the hierarchy, to suppress all monasteries, to confiscate the estates of the Church, to proclaim Cobham Protector of the realm. Cobham is said to have instigated a Scottish invasion.[d]

It must be remembered that the title of Henry V. was at this time by no means generally acknowledged; his throne not secure. Reports that Richard II. was still alive in Scotland were credited by many; the elder line of Lionel Duke of Clarence (as appears by the conspiracy of the Earl of Cambridge, Scrope, and Grey of Heton, during the next year) had its partisans. Henry was known, till the battle of Agincourt, only as a wild and dissolute, if gallant, generous, and active youth, accused of having designed to seize his father's crown in his lifetime. The lower orders, till they were intoxicated into loyalty by the French conquests, cherished the memory of Richard II.; hated the usurper, loved not his main support, the Church. The levelling doctrines of the peasant insurgents under Richard cannot have been entirely crushed. Of the more fanatic Lollards some may have embraced those tenets. The whole sect may have begun to madden into despair at this close and manifest alliance between the Lancastrian Kings and the hierarchy. It is not improbable that wild schemes may have been formed, it is certain that they were dreaded and suspected.

The King, with his bold military decision, suddenly moved from his palace at Eltham, in which it had been rumoured that the conspirators were preparing to surprise him and put him to death. He appeared in Westminster. Immediately, St. Giles's Fields, the place of assembly, as it was bruited abroad, for the whole host of the Lollards, was on a sudden surrounded by the royal troops. It was given out, that in the dusk of that very evening, or in the

[d] Walsingham.

night, countless armed men were seen creeping along the lanes and under the hedges to the place of rendezvous. A few persons were seized, Sir Roger Acton, Sir John Browne, and J. Burnley, a rector. Their excuse was that they came to hear Burnley preach. From others was extorted a confession that they expected the Lord Cobham. The King had ordered the City gates to be closed, for it was further rumoured that 50,000 servants and apprentices were prepared to sally forth.

No outbreak took place; there was not the least commotion or resistance. Nine and thirty persons were instantly put on trial and executed.[e] Confessions, whether voluntary or extorted, true or false, were announced, of the vast and formidable conspiracy. After the execution, a new and violent Statute was passed for the suppression of Lollards.

The royal proclamation and the indictment of Oldcastle Lord Cobham, Sir Roger Acton, and others, announced to the nation, which had hardly time for amazement and terror from the rapidity of the King's movements, the menaced insurrection, the secret conspiracy, the gathering together of the conspirators, the 20,000 men said to be ready in arms. It declared their object to have been the utter abolition of the State, the abrogation of the office of Prelate, the suppression of all religious orders, the slaying of our Lord the King, his brothers, the Prelates, and other nobles of the realm; the proscription of all monks and friars, the despoiling and destruction of all Cathedral churches, of many other churches and holy monasteries; they designed to raise Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, to be Regent of the realm.[f]

How far were the fears of the government real? On

[e] The meeting was on the night of the 7th Jan. (Sunday). Was a preaching to take place, and either to cover the movements of the conspirators, or was it a pretext seized by the government? On Monday (8th) the prisoners had been taken and sent to gaol. The bill was preferred against the 27 (or 39) prisoners on the 9th. On that day and the 10th, all, including three peers, were tried and condemned for treason and heresy. On the 12th they were executed. Compare House of Lancaster, note xxviii.

[f] The indictment is in Fox. "Et dictum Johannem Oldcastle regentem ejusdem regni constituere, et quamplurima regimina secundum eorum voluntatem intra regnum prædictum quasi gens sine capite in finalem destructionem fidei Catholicæ et cleri, quam status et majestatis dignitatis regal. infra idem regnum ordinare."

what were they grounded? How far was the proclamation intended to strike terror into the Lollards and their abettors, to arouse the hatred of all loyal subjects and lovers of order against them? The whole was an affair of four days: the pretended insurrection, its suppression, the trial, the execution of at least between twenty and thirty men, some of high rank.[8] And where all this time was the terrible and mysterious Cobham? Of his agency, still less of his presence, there is neither proof nor vestige. It is only known that he was proscribed; that for three years he lay concealed from all the keen bloodhounds who were induced to trace him by honest hatred of his treasons, by the baser hope of favour or reward.

At the end of this period (yet this is but a doubtful rumour) he suddenly appeared near St. Albans. If accidental, this apparition was singularly ill-timed. It was during an invasion of the Scots, with whom he had before been charged with being in secret correspondence. Again he was lost to the keen sight alike of his admirers and his enemies. At length he was taken, after a vigorous resistance by Sir Edward Charlton, Lord of Powis. Such importance was attached to his arrest, that Charlton received 1000 marks as reward.

Cobham suffered at once the punishment of a traitor and a heretic. This punishment was inflicted in St. Giles's Fields, with all the blended barbarity of both modes of execution. He was hung on a gallows, with a fire at his feet, and slowly consumed. He was said to have declared himself a faithful subject of his liege Lord, Richard II., thus avouching, as though in secret intelligence with the Scots, the wild tale, unquestionably current, that Richard was still living in that kingdom. These and other strange rumours rest on slight authority. His conduct was throughout (this we would believe more fully) that of a noble religious man. Before his execution

Death of Cobham, 1417.

[8] In the Close Rolls at this time appears an entry: "To John Maihewe and others, his companion jurors upon an inquest held for the King at Westminster upon certain traitors and rebels against the King's person, the money paid by the hands of the said John in discharge of 6*l.*, which the Lord the King ordered them of his gift, by writ 6*l.*: also for a breakfast to others, including the Lord Mayor, 2*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.*" There is another to Thomas Burton (the King's spy), for watching the Lollards, 100 shillings.

he fell on his knees, and implored forgiveness on his enemies. He addressed the multitude in a few words, urging them to obey the law of God in the Scripture, to reject all evil in their lives. He refused the aid of a priest: "to God only, now as ever present, he would confess, and of him entreat pardon." His last words, drowned by the crackling flames, were praise of God. The people wept and prayed with him; they heard in contemptuous silence the declarations of the priests, that Cobham died an enemy of God, an heretic to the Church.[h]

We have followed English Wycliffism to the martyrdom of Lord Cobham. It is singular that it was not in a Teutonic but a Sclavonian kingdom, not in a language kindred to the English, but in one of a totally different stock, dissonant in most of its words and ideas, that the opinions of Wycliffe were to be received with eager zeal, propagated with cordial acceptance. In Bohemia, the Reformer's works—jealously watched, trampled under foot, burned by the hierarchy—were received, multiplied, translated, honoured as the exposition of the true and genuine Gospel. The apostles, the heirs, of Wycliffism, were John Huss and Jerome of Prague; we must return to Constance to witness their influence, their death-defying strength, their unextinguishable vitality: the death of Huss preceded that of Cobham two years.

[h] Though rapid in my relation, I have been slow, if I may say faltering, in all this history of Cobham. All is obscure and contradictory, especially the St. Giles's Fields insurrection. To all Roman Catholic writers Oldcastle is a turbulent, dangerous rebel, as well as a heretic; to Protestants, a loyal subject, as well as a martyr. The authorities are heaped together, but require most diligent and suspicious sifting, in Fox.

CHAPTER VIII.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

THROUGHOUT Christendom all eyes, all minds were centered on the German city of Constance. There for the first time was to meet the great Universal Council, the representative assembly of Latin Christianity. The older Œcumenic Councils had been Eastern and Greek, with a few, a very few, delegates from the West. The more famous Latin Councils, as those of the Lateran, of Vienne, of Lyons, were assemblages of prelates, whom the Pope condescended to summon, in order to take counsel with him, and under him, on the affairs of the Church. The Council of Pisa had been hardly more than a college of Cardinals, with the advice and support of certain Prelates and ambassadors of sovereign princes. The Council of Constance assumed more than the power of judging on the claims of rival Pontiffs; the supremacy of the Pope over a General Council, of a General Council over the Pope, was now an inevitable question. The Council placed itself at once above the three contesting Popes, each with a doubtful and disputed title; each with some part, though but a small part, of Christendom adhering to his obedience. If such a Council, sweeping away these ignoble rivals, might create a new successor of St. Peter, they might impose conditions and limit his autocracy. Who could foresee the power which they would assume, the power which they would have the ambition, the strength to exercise? Nor was the one absorbing paramount question the election of the Pope: it was not only from its anarchy but its sunken state that the Church must be vindicated and re-established; the reformation of the Church in its head and in all its members, was among the avowed objects, it was the special function, of the Council;

the maintenance of the unity of the Church against formidable heresiarchs; the suppression of heresies, which had ceased to be those of rebellious sects, had become those of rebellious nations. In Constance would be seen of the monarchs of Christendom perhaps one only, but he the greatest, the Emperor, who stood higher than any successor of Charlemagne since the Othos, the Fredericks, or Rodolph of Hapsburg. But there might be three Pontiffs, each of whom had worn, each boasted himself the rightful wearer of the Papal tiara. There would certainly be the whole College of Cardinals; the most famous and learned churchmen from every kingdom of the West; even those dreaded heresiarchs, the heirs and successors of the English Wycliffe, who had nearly severed the kingdom of Bohemia from Latin Christendom.

A.D. 1414. In June the quiet streets of ancient Constance were disturbed by the first preparations for the great drama which was to be performed within her walls. The Bishop elect of Augsburg and Count Eberhard of Nellenberg entered the city to choose quarters for the Emperor. Hopes began to spread, to strengthen, that the high contracting parties were in earnest; that the Universal Council, so often announced, so often eluded, would at length take place. In August came the Cardinal of Viviers, the Bishop of Ostia, with a distinguished suite, to take order for the accommodation of the Pope John XXIII. and of his Cardinals. From that period to the Feast of All Saints, the day named for the opening of the Council, and for several months after, the converging roads which led to this central city were crowded with all ranks and orders, ecclesiastics and laymen, Sovereign Princes, and Ambassadors of Sovereigns, Archbishops and Bishops, the heads or representatives of the great Monastic Orders, theologians, doctors of Canon or of Civil Law, delegates from renowned Universities, some with splendid and numerous retainers, some like trains of pilgrims, some singly and on foot. With these, merchants, traders of every kind and degree, and every sort of wild and strange vehicle. It was not only, it might seem, to be a solemn Christian Council, but an European congress, a vast central fair,

where every kind of commerce was to be conducted on the boldest scale, and where chivalrous or histrionic or other common amusements were provided for idle hours and for idle people. It might seem a final and concentrated burst and manifestation of mediæval devotion, mediæval splendour, mediæval diversions: all ranks, all orders, all pursuits, all professions, all trades, all artisans, with their various attire, habits, manners, language, crowded to one single city.

On the steep slope of the Alps were seen winding down, now emerging from the autumn-tinted chestnut groves, now lost again, the rich cavalcades of the Cardinals, the Prelates, the Princes of Italy, each with their martial guard or their ecclesiastical pomp. The blue spacious lake was studded with boats and barks, conveying the Bishops and Abbots, the knights and grave burghers, of the Tyrol, of Eastern and Northern Germany, Hungary, and from the Black Forest and Thuringia. Along the whole course of the Rhine, from Cologne, even from Brabant, Flanders, or the furthest North, from England and from France, marched Prelates, Abbots, Doctors of Law, celebrated Schoolmen, following the upward course of the stream, and gathering as they advanced new hosts from the provinces and cities to the east or west. Day after day the air was alive with the standards of Princes; and the banners emblasoned with the armorial bearings of Sovereigns, of Nobles, of Knights, of Imperial Cities; or glittered with the silver crozier, borne before some magnificent Bishop or mitred Abbot. Night after night the silence was broken by the poursuivants and trumpeters announcing the arrival of some high and mighty Count or Duke, or the tinkling mule-bells of some lowlier caravan. The streets were crowded with curious spectators, eager to behold some splendid prince or ambassador, some churchman famous in the pulpit, in the school, in the council, it might be in the battle field, or even some renowned minnesinger, or popular jongleur. The city almost appeared to enlarge itself to welcome week after week the gathering strangers. The magistrates had taken admirable measures to maintain order. Every one seems to glide into and settle down in

his proper place. Everywhere were gathering crowds, yet no tumult: among these crowds now a low deep murmur, now a hush of expectation, no clamour, no confusion, no quarrel, no riot. Constance might seem determined to support her dignity, as chosen for a kind of temporary capital of Christendom. The awfulness of the great subjects which were to be discussed had, as it were, enthralled the mind of man to a calm seriousness; even amusements and diversions were under sober discipline. Whatever there was, and doubtless there was much, of gross and licentious, was kept out of sight.

Pope John.

Of all those vast multitudes there was no one whose fate might seem so to tremble on the balance; who could look on this wonderful scene with such profound emotions of hope and fear; to whom the Council was at once so full of awe, yet at the same time, to his yet unextinguished ambition, might eventually prove such a scene of pride, of triumph, as John XXIII. The Pope had every imaginable guarantee, notwithstanding some dubious words,[a] not only for his person, but for his dignity. His right, in concurrence with the Emperor, to summon the Council had been admitted by Sigismund. The Imperial Edict asserted his plenary jurisdiction; the magistrates of Constance had taken a solemn oath on the direct demand of the Emperor, to receive him with all befitting honours as the one true Pope, to protect him to the utmost, to give him free liberty to enter, to remain, or to depart from their city.[b] He was to have entire independent authority over his own court: his safe conduct was to be respected by all the officers of the city.

Yet had the Pope, notwithstanding all these solemn guarantees, notwithstanding his wealth, and the array of Cardinals attached, as he hoped, to his interests, with the Italian Bishops, almost in number enough to overrule the Council,[c] strong and sad misgivings. He sought to make

[a] "Ne exinde occasionem non veniendi habeat." Such is the suspicious language of Sigismund.

[b] "Ita quod semper et omni tempore licebit ei stare in dictâ civitate et ab eâ recedere, non obstante quocunque impedimento." See the oath in Von der Hardt, l. v. p. 5. The Emperor's stipulations to the Pope were not of much more value than those to John Huss.

[c] "Johannes venit Constantiam, cum multis Prælatis Italiæ, ut per votorum

friends in every quarter in his hour of need. Frederick, Duke of Austria, was the hereditary enemy of the House of Luxemburg. His territories almost surrounded the city of Constance; his strong castles crowned many of the hills around, which might be seen from the borders of the lake; the Tyrol and the Black Forest were among his possessions. Frederick, as if to show the utmost respect to the Pope, met him at Trent. The Pope was lavish of honours, gifts, and promises. At Meran he named the Austrian Gonfalonier of the Church, and of his privy council. He assigned him as stipend for these functions 6000 florins a year. Frederick, besides these advantages, looked to the support of the Pope in certain feuds with the Bishops of Trent, Coire, and Brixen. He swore fealty to the Pope; he promised all aid and protection on the road, and in the city of Constance, and to secure his free retreat from that city.[d] Frederick of Austria was closely allied with the Duke of Burgundy; the Duke's sister was the widow of Frederick's brother, Leopold of Austria; she resided on her dowry lands in the Austrian States. The Duke of Burgundy had strong reasons for courting the favour of the Pope. Among the causes to be judged by the Council of Constance was that of Jean Petit, whose atrocious defence of the atrocious murder of the Duke of Orleans by Burgundy or his partisans, was to be arraigned in the face of Christendom. An alliance with Austria was almost an alliance with Burgundy, now, whether on the French or English side, almost commanding France. The Marquis of Baden, too, and the Count of Nassau received significant presents from John XXIII.; and if the Emperor should show hostility to the Pope, the Pope seemed sure of a partisan in the mightiest Prelate of the empire, the Archbishop of Mentz. As John descended towards Constance he invested the Abbot of S. Ulric at Kreuzlingen with the mitre, the usual privilege of Bishops alone. Thus, even at the gates of Constance, he would secure a powerful friend.

pluralitatem se conservaret in Papatu." —Ebendorfer in Pez. Script. Austriæ, ii. 825.

[d] Gerhard de Rio asserts, from Austrian documents, that the Pope communicated this treaty to Sigismund: probably the articles which could not be concealed; the honours and dignities conferred on the Austrian, not the secret stipulations for protection.

Yet, despite all these precautions, there were dismal moments of despondency. As he came down the steep Arlberg his sledge was overset; his attendants crowded round to know if he was hurt. "In the devil's name what do I lying here?" As he wound round the last declivity, and Constance lay below in her deep valley, washed by the lake, the Pope looked down and exclaimed, "A trap for foxes."

Oct. 26.

Constance received the Pope with every sign of respect and spiritual loyalty. The magistrates and the clergy attended him through the streets, and to the venerable Minster. Nine Cardinals, about six hundred followers, formed the pompous retinue of his Holiness. The great Festival of All Saints had been named as peculiarly appropriate for the opening of the saintly Council; but from various causes, of the Prelates, except those of Italy, few had arrived. Though the Council was opened by the Pope in person on the 5th November, the first public session was adjourned to Nov. 16. In the meantime certain preliminaries were arranged. Twelve auditors of the Rota were named to judge ecclesiastical causes. Congregations were held to regulate the order of the sittings and to appoint officers. At one of these congregations the Pope issued his inhibition to all members of the Council that no one might depart without permission. On the 2nd December six more Cardinals had arrived; these with the nine present formed a fair College. But on the 3rd another arrival caused still greater excitement. There entered the city a pale thin man, in mean attire, yet escorted by three nobles of his country, with a great troop of other followers from attachment or curiosity; he came under a special safe conduct from the Emperor, which guaranteed in the strictest and amplest terms his safe entrance and safe departure from the Imperial City. This was the famous heresiarch of Bohemia, John Huss. Nothing could be more opportune than his early arrival for the Papal policy.

Oct. 28.

John Huss.

The Council had been summoned for three principal objects. I. The union of the Church under one acknowledged Pope. II. The reformation of the Clergy in its head and in its members. III. The extirpation of erro-

neous and heretical doctrines. Other subordinate questions were to be submitted to the supreme tribunal of Christendom: the examination of Jean Petit's defence of the assassination of the Duke of Orleans, the proceedings of the Flagellants, and some less important matters. On the order in which the Council should proceed as to the three great leading topics depended the influence, the title, perhaps the fate of the Pope. The vital question of all, not deliberately proposed, but at the root of all the other questions—the superiority of the Council to the Pope, of the Pope to the Council—might be postponed; if postponed, eluded. This would be the case if the Council could be occupied by matter on which Pope and Council might agree, which might inflame the common passions, and direct their almost maddening zeal against one common foe, one common victim. Let, then, the suppression of heresy be the first paramount absorbing subject of debate. All precedent was in the Pope's favour; it had ever been the first act of Œcumenic Councils, from that of Nicea, to guard the faith and to condemn heresy. So, too, the Council of Constance, commencing at this point, might be held a continuation, hardly more than a prorogation, of the Council of Pisa. And this to the Pope was life or death. For if the Council of Pisa was thus even tacitly recognised, his title among the three claimants to the Papacy, his absolute title, resting on the solemn decree of that Council, was irrefragable. Could he not, begirt with his Cardinals (their common interest might guarantee their fidelity), and with the overpowering suffrages of the Italian Prelates, centre the whole attention of the Council on this one subject? Could he not set the whole host in full cry on the track of this quarry? At least during this discussion he and his Italians would have been gaining a preponderating influence; he, for months, would have been permitted to guide and rule the Council. What if he should render the signal service of condemning, still better of inducing these dreaded heresiarchs to recant, could the ungrateful Church then cast him off? Then he would return to Italy the recognised Pope of the Council of Constance. If not, some time having been thus occupied, a thousand accidents, dissensions, plague,

famine, the opportune death of some important personage, might dissipate the Council before they could enter on more dangerous ground.

Nor was this an unwarranted, ungrounded hope; the policy had every promise of success. The doctrines of Wycliffe, which Huss and his followers were accused of propagating in the villages and cities of Bohemia, even in the University of Prague, were generally odious. Those who knew least of them, looked on them with the terror of ignorance; those who knew them best saw that they struck at the root of the whole hierarchical system, in the common view the whole religion of Christ. The foremost Reformers, D'Ailly, Gerson, Zabarella, and the few Cardinals in that party, would behold perhaps with greater horror, as crossing their more moderate and sober designs, those innovators who laid their hands not on the corruptions of the Clergy only, but on their possessions, their rights, their immunities, their privileges, their spiritual powers, and even on the accredited orthodox doctrines of the faith. They, too, might be tempted to assert this suppression of heresy, which they dreaded with such profound dread, hated with such unmitigated hatred, to be the first, preliminary, inevitable duty of the great Council.

This insurrection, moreover, against the sublime autocracy of the Latin hierarchy; this appeal from the traditional Christianity of the West, the growth of ages, with all its mythology, legendary history, law, philosophy, ritual, venerable usages, and with all its vast system of rights and obligations and its tenure of property, to the primal and simpler Christianity of the Lord and his Apostles; this first attempt to substitute for an obedience to an outward law, and to an all-embracing discipline enforced by ecclesiastical penal statute, the religion of the inward conscience, self-dependent rather than dependent on the ghostly adviser; this assertion of the freedom of thought, limited only by the boundaries of the human faculties and the plain written word of God; this dawning moral and religious revolution, though it had begun in Teutonic England, and had been first embodied in the vernacular Anglo-Saxon of Wycliffe's Bible and Tracts,

and in the poetry of Langland and of Chaucer, was not yet taken up by the Teutonic mind. It was propagated only under most unfavourable auspices, in a remote corner of Christendom, among a nation which spoke an unformed language, intelligible to themselves alone, and not more akin to German than to Latin; a nation, as it were, intruded into the Teutonic Empire, thought barbarian, and from late circumstances held in hostile jealousy by the Teutonic commonwealth. Reformation not yet Teutonic.

Bohemia was thus an insulated stranger among the German principalities, a stranger with a right of suffrage for the Imperial crown, but striving to preserve her Sclavonic nationality against the Teutonic element which, from her connection with the Empire, was forcing itself into her territory, her usages, and even pressing on her language. Bohemia, too, laboured under the unpopularity of having given to the Imperial throne a Sovereign, Charles IV., of whom the German annals speak with bitter hatred and contempt, but who had been beloved, and deservedly beloved, for his wise laws, admirable institutions, and for his national policy in his native kingdom. His father, John of Bohemia, that restless chivalrous adventurer who fell at Crecy, was a German in manners and in heart; Charles a Bohemian who might seem to sacrifice the ungrateful and intractable Empire to his hereditary Kingdom. As King of Bohemia, Charles was the creator of the realm: to him she owed equal laws, sound institutions, magnificent cities, at least Prague, which Charles adorned with splendid churches, noble palaces, stately bridges, her famous University.[e] Bohemia.

Charles IV. had at least not discouraged the first Reformers, who before the time of Huss protested in the strongest terms against the vices of the clergy, and the abuses of the Roman Court. The Prelate Conrad Strickna, during his reign, had denounced the progress of these opinions. The Reformer, Milecz von Kremsar, was the King's Court Preacher.

The deposition of King Wenzel, the son of Charles,

[e] Read the glowing description of the reign of Charles IV., in Palacky, *et seqq.* Geschichte von Böhmen, ii. p. 2, p. 328,

from the Empire by the Electors on the Rhine, was at once a sign and an aggravation of the jealousy of Teutonism against Bohemia. During the reign of Wenzel, a still more stirring teacher, Matthias von Zanow, had advanced the bolder axiom that it was gross superstition to reverence the edicts of the Pope on articles of faith, equally with the words of Christ and his Apostles. The Church, to resume her dignity, must be entirely renewed in the spirit of the Gospel.[f] The marriage of King Wenzel's sister, Anne of Bohemia, to Richard II. of England, had brought the two realms into close connection, exactly at the time when the doctrines of Wycliffe were making their most rapid progress. The Queen herself, as has been said, was strongly impressed with the new doctrines. Bohemian scholars sat at the feet of the bold professor of theology at Oxford; English students were found at Prague. The writings of Wycliffe were brought in great numbers, some in Latin, some translated into Bohemian, and disseminated by admiring partisans.

A.D. 1369. King Wenzel (Wenceslaus). A.D. 1394.

John of Hussinetz, a Bohemian village, was a man of eloquence and an accomplished scholar, of severe morals, but gentle, friendly, accessible to all. He became Preacher in the University chapel, called Bethlehem, and Confessor to the Queen Sophia. So long as his fervid sermons denounced the vices of the world, the Clergy the Monks and the Friars were among his most admiring hearers; but as he began to condemn the luxury, the pride, the licentiousness of the Clergy and the abuses of the Church, their admiration turned to animosity. He would have been persecuted, if he had not been protected by the Court; for such doctrines were not the less heard with favour by the Court because they were repulsive to the Clergy. The Schism in the Papacy had shaken the awe of the hierarchy to its base, and King Wenzel had strong grounds for personal hostility against that hierarchy. The Archbishop-Electors had been the leaders in the defection, the prime movers in his deposal from the Empire. The Pope, Boniface IX., had sanctioned their haughty

John Huss.

[f] Weissenberg, ii. p. 121.

proceedings. For many years, too, the sale of benefices had been so notorious by both Popes, that Wenzel in Bohemia, Sigismund in Hungary,[g] had not only prohibited the exportation of money to Rome, but had broken off all intercourse with the Papal Court.

Just at this time a scholar of John Huss[h] returned from his studies in Paris and Oxford: he brought many writings of Wycliffe. These writings not merely inveighed against the idleness and corruptions of the Clergy and of the Monks, but broke in at once on more perilous ground. Wycliffe had been already condemned by the Church as an heresiarch. Huss shrunk at first from the infection: he read the books with suspicion and dislike, so much so that he had nearly committed the godless volumes to the flames. He found, on more careful study, deeper and neglected truths. Still, however, much of Wycliffe's doctrine could not command his assent, but much worked by slow degrees into his mind and into his teaching.

The Archbishop Sbinko of Prague had looked on Huss with favour: he could neither be ignorant of the change in the Preacher's views, nor of the cause of that change. He issued his sentence of condemnation; he threatened all who should promulgate the tenets of Wycliffe with the heretic's death, the stake. Huss was at first appalled; he was quiet for a time; but the Confessor of the Queen, and the idol of one-half the University of Prague, could not long hold his peace, for he was not the champion of Wycliffe's free opinions alone, now forcing themselves into a slow popularity, but of the Bohemian against the German students; and, extraordinary as it may seem, on a subject which stirred the hearts of the scholars to as great a depth, of the Realist against the Nominalist philosophy. This strife hurried on the conflicting parties to the inevitable schism. The deposition of their King Wenzel from the Empire had wounded the Bohemian pride: they held the Germans as strangers and aliens in their national University. The German Professors had taken part with the Archbishop in the implied censure of Huss. By a

[g] Ashbach, Kaiser Sigmond, ii. 24.
[h] He had the ill-sounding name of Faulfisch.

singular revolution, the Realistic philosophy, which had been the sworn ally of orthodoxy, the philosophy of Lanfranc and Anselm against Abélard, of Aquinas against Ockham, had changed sides. The great French divines, Gerson, D'Ailly (perhaps partly from their French perspicacity), the Germans in general, from the more exclusive study of the Aristotelian Scholasticism, had warped round to the more rationalistic Nominalism. The University of Prague was rent with feuds; students met students, not in the schools of disputation, but in the streets and on the bridges, and fought out the battles of Churchmen and Wycliffites, of Germans and Bohemians, of Nominalists and Realists. At length the Bohemian faction, with Huss at their head, obtained from the King the abrogation of the privileges of the Germans in the votes for academic offices. The sullen Germans, and with them the Poles, abandoned the city. Of thirty thousand, a great part wandered to Leipsic, and founded a rival University. Huss became Rector of the University of Prague. His popularity triumphed even over the interests of the citizens, which suffered severely from the departure of the German students.

A.D. 1409.

Huss now preached boldly and without reserve the Wycliffite doctrines, at least as far as denunciations, not only against the corruptions, but against the wealth of the Clergy. The King heard with satisfaction the grateful maxim that the royal power was far above that of the hierarchy; the Archbishop and the Clergy were constrained to murmuring silence, while all Bohemia seemed falling off to these fearful opinions.

The Council of Pisa had uttered its sentence of deposition against Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. The Archbishop of Prague adhered to Gregory; the King, Huss, and the Bohemians to the Council. Huss was emboldened to assail the Papal power itself. The King answered to the complaints of the Archbishop, "So long as Master Huss preached against us of the world, you rejoiced, and declared that the Spirit of God spoke in him. It is now your turn." But the accession of Alexander V., whom Bohemia, having acknowledged the Council of Pisa,

could not refuse to accept, gave the Archbishop courage. He obtained a Bull from the Pope for the suppression of the Wycliffite doctrines. He threatened the refractory teachers. He collected no less than two hundred writings of the odious English heresiarch, and committed them publicly to the flames; but the King compelled him to pay the value of the books to those from whom he had seized them by his arbitrary ecclesiastical power. Huss continued to preach. He appealed from the Pope to Christ himself, the one final unerring Judge: "I, John Huss, offer this appeal to Jesus Christ, my Master and my just Judge, who knows, defends, and judges the just cause."[1]

The pious Alexander was succeeded by Balthasar Cossa, John XXIII. Among the first acts of Pope John was a citation to John Huss, the man of irreproachable morals, to appear before the tribunal of a Pope charged at least with every imaginable crime. The Bohemian King and the nation would not permit Huss to cross the Alps; they alleged fear of his German enemies; a pompous embassy of three theologians appeared in his stead. The Archbishop, from prudence or more generous feeling, received from Huss a confession of faith, with which he declared himself satisfied. He announced to the Roman Court that heresy no longer contaminated his diocese.

No answer came from Rome, but there came the vendors of indulgences for the war of the Pope against King Ladislaus of Naples. The vendors abstained from none of those insolent exaggerations of the value of their wares which were so obnoxious to sounder piety. Huss broke out in a torrent of eloquent indignation. His scholar, Jerome Foulfish, burned the Bull of Indulgences under the gallows. The preachers of the Indulgences were exposed to insult, outrage, persecution. The magistrates interfered; some rioters were seized and executed; the people rose; the town-house was stormed; the remains of the rioters taken up and venerated as reliques. News arrived that the ambassadors of Huss, of the University, and of the King, had been thrown into prison at Rome;

[1] Opera, John Huss, i. 17. L'Enfant, Concile de Constance, i. p. 33.

that Huss was under the ban of excommunication, Prague under interdict. The timid King shrunk from the contest. Huss withdrew for a time from the city, but only by his eloquent preachings all over the country to influence now not Prague alone, but all Bohemia, with indignation against the abuses of the hierarchy. His writings, some in Latin, some in his native dialect, spread with rapidity. If in these he maintained some prudent or perhaps indeterminate ambiguity on the established doctrines, he struck boldly at all the bearings of those doctrines on Papal and on priestly authority.

John Huss then was no isolated teacher; no follower of a condemned English heretic: he was more even than head of a sect; he almost represented a kingdom, no doubt much more than half of Bohemia. King Wenzel and his Queen were on his side, at least as against the Clergy.

Why Huss appeared at Constance.

The Emperor Sigismund aspired to restore peace to the Church. The Council of Constance had been summoned to reform the Church in its head and in its members: its proclaimed object was the extirpation of all abuses throughout Christendom. It was not for Huss to stand aloof in fear or suspicion. He had appealed to a Council. If his opinions were just and true, he could not shrink from bringing their justice and truth before a Council which comprehended not the high dignitaries alone, but also the most consummate theologians of Christendom. As yet, however some of his opinions might seem to lean to speculative Wycliffitism, he was like others of great name, avowedly no more than an ardent reformer of abuses. He obtained from the University of Prague, from the Estates of Bohemia, from Conrad Archbishop of Prague, and even from Nicolas Bishop of Nazareth, the Grand Inquisitor, testimonials to his orthodoxy and irreproachable life. Yet he was not, he could not be, without dark misgivings. He left a letter only to be opened in case of his death at Constance: it contained his last will and his confession.[k] His valedictory address to his followers enjoined them to maintain their

[k] Among the sins that burthened his conscience was playing at chess and losing his temper when beaten.

faith, to pray earnestly for his safe return. "He expected to meet as many enemies at Constance as our Lord at Jerusalem—the wicked Clergy, and even some secular Princes, and those Pharisees the Monks."

Huss sets out for Constance. Oct. 21.

The fame of Huss travelled before him: curiosity or interest in his doctrines triumphed over the German aversion to the Bohemian. In many towns he held conferences even with the Clergy, and parted from them on amicable terms. At Nuremburg he was met by three Bohemian nobles, who bore from Spires the Imperial safe-conduct, couched in the strictest and fullest terms, guaranteeing his safe entrance and his safe return from Constance.[m] John of Chlum, Wenzel of Duba, Henry of Lazenbach, were charged to watch and keep guard over their countryman, who travelled under the special protection of the Emperor.

Not many days after the arrival of the Pope, John Huss, as has been said, entered Constance. He was graciously received by the Pope himself. Nothing was said of the ban of excommunication which still hung over him: it is doubtful whether it was not legally annulled by his reception before the Pope. Strong expressions are attributed to the Pope: "If he had slain my brother, I would not permit, as far as is in my power, any harm to be done to him in Constance."[n] The Pope, on whom religion hung so loosely, may not have had that deep aversion for, he may not fully have comprehended, the bearing of the Wycliffite tenets; still less could he comprehend the stern, stubborn conscientiousness which would not swerve from, and which would boldly assert such opinions in the face of danger or death. Noble religious fanaticism has constantly baffled the reckoning of the most profound worldly sagacity. He might fondly suppose the possibility of the Bohemian's submission to Papal arguments, impressed by Papal majesty; and the submission

[m] The safe-conduct may be seen in many publications. L'Enfant; Von der Hardt; the latest and perhaps most accurate version in Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund, ii. 29.

[n] "Etiamsi Johannes Huss fratrem sibi germanum occidisset, se tamen nullo modo commissurum, quantum in ipso situm est, ut aliqua ei fiat injuria, quamdiu Constantiæ esset."—Von der Hardt, iv. p. 11.

of so famous a heretic to his milder admonitions would give him overweening weight in the Council. But with the more keen-eyed and inflexible Italian Cardinals, Huss was only a barbarian and a heretic. They could not but discern (for they had nothing to blind their instinct) the vital oppugnancy of his views to the hierarchical system. Huss himself could not remain in modest and inoffensive privacy. Partisans, admirers, would crowd around him; his zeal would not permit him in base timidity to shrink from the avowal of his creed, whether by preaching in his house or among his followers. The Bishop of Constance admonished him, but in vain, and forbade his celebrating Mass while yet unabsolved.

The arrival of Stephen Palecz and Michael de Causis, the bitter and implacable adversaries of Huss, with whom he had been involved in fierce controversy, changed the suspended state of affairs. These men stood forward openly as his accusers: they swept away all the fairer, milder, or more subtile interpretations by which Huss reconciled his own doctrines with the orthodox creed, especially as regarded the clergy. Huss had declared wicked Popes, wicked Cardinals, wicked Prelates, to be utterly without authority, their excommunications void, their administration of the Sacraments as only to be valid by some nice distinction. Palecz and De Causis cast all these maxims in their naked, unmitigated offensiveness before the indignant hierarchy. Huss was summoned, yet by a deputation which still showed respect, the Bishops of Augsburg and Trent, to appear before the Consistory of the Pope and Cardinals. He obeyed, protesting, nevertheless, that he came to render account to the Council, not to the Consistory. The charges of heresy were read. Huss quietly declared that he had rather die than be justly condemned as a heretic. "If convinced of error, he would make full recantation." He retired, but his lodging was encircled from that time by watchful sentinels.[o] A monk was let

[o] Aschbach (p. 30). here inserts the attempt of Huss at flight, which the two authors (perhaps they are but one authority), Reichenthal and the author in D'Achery, assign to a much later period. To my judgement, Aschbach's view is utterly improbable; and on such points Reichenthal, who does not care much for religious questions, is worthy of full confidence.

loose upon him, to ensnare him with dangerous questions. Huss had the shrewdness to detect in the monk, who affected the utmost simplicity, one of the subtlest theologians of the day.

Four weeks after his arrival at Constance, notwithstanding his appeal to the Imperial safe-conduct, notwithstanding the protest of his noble Bohemian protector, John de Chlum, Huss was committed to prison in the Bishop's palace. To De Chlum the Pope protested that it was done without his authority. The Pope might find it expedient to disclaim such an act. A congregation was summoned to hear eight articles promoted by the Bohemian, Michael de Causis, against John Huss. Three Commissioners had been named by the Pope. A more numerous Commission of Cardinals, Bishops, and Doctors was appointed to conduct the inquiry. From his first prison he was conducted to a closer and more safe one in the Dominican Convent.[p] There he fell ill, and was attended by the Pope's physicians. He recovered, and in his prison wrote several works, which were eagerly dispersed among his brethren. Huss in prison.

John de Chlum took bold and active measures for the release of Huss. He communicated this insolent violation of the Imperial safe-conduct to Sigismund, who was on his way from his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle. The Emperor broke out into wrath: he gave orders, that if the Pope and Cardinals did not obey his mandate, the doors of the prison should be opened by force. But no one ventured to invade the Dominican cloister, and the Council yet respected the ordinances of the Pope and Cardinals. De Chlum affixed writings on all the church doors in Constance, declaring, in strong language, the imprisonment of Huss to be an outrage against the Emperor; that all who had presumed to violate the Imperial safe-conduct, and still presumed to resist the demands of the Imperial Ambassador for his release, would be called to account.

So far, even up to the arrival of the Emperor, Pope John had maintained uncontested supremacy in the Council. His Bull had been read at the first Session, as the

[p] L'Enfant, i. p. 64.

authority for its proceedings. Zabarella, the all-honoured Cardinal of Florence, in his opening speech, assumed throughout the presidency of the Pope. The Pope named all the officers, and distributed the functions which were submitted to and accepted by the Council. One incident alone threatened his sole dignity. The Archbishop of Ragusa, and other legates of Gregory XII., had made their entrance. On the same night the Archbishop affixed over the gates of his lodging the Papal arms of Gregory XII., with the keys and the triple crown. John resisted this daring invasion in the name of a Pope deposed by the Council of Pisa. The Council, after some stormy debate, pronounced in favour of the Pope, thus again recognizing the acts of the Council of Pisa. The obnoxious arms disappeared.

Pope John supreme in the Council.

On Christmas Eve tidings arrived that Sigismund, now having received the Imperial crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, had reached Oberlingen, on the northern shore of the lake. Before morning dawn he entered Constance. Among his first acts was attendance at the Mass. The Emperor, according to usage, in the dalmatic of a Deacon, read the Gospel—the Gospel which sounded ominous in the ears of the Pope: "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus." The sermon preached three days after, by Peter d'Ailly, Cardinal of Cambray, must at times have sent a cold shudder of dismay to the heart of John. The text was, "There shall be signs in the Sun, and in the Moon, and in the Stars:" a text literally applicable to the last advent of Christ, spiritually to his advent in an Œcumenic Council. The Sun was the spiritual power, the Pope; the Moon the temporal, the Emperor; the Stars the Cardinals, Prelates, and Doctors in the firmament of the Council. But the Sun, for the plenitude of his power, must fulfil certain conditions. If the supreme Pastor shall have risen by bad means, by unjust and reprobate ambition; if he shall have led a scandalous and dishonest life; if he shall have ruled negligently or tyrannically, he is but the phantom of a sun. "Oh! that the Omnipotent Trinity would dash down these three statues in the Sun's house, the Church of Rome. .... The Holy

Trinity of the Divine Persons is not more adorable than a trinity of Popes abominable." But the lofty churchman kept the Moon, the temporal power, in its due subordination. To the Emperor himself he uttered no words but those of high honour; "yet the Imperial power must not think to preside in the Council, but to execute her decrees." The Council, he distinctly avers, derived its legitimate authority from being summoned by the Pope; but once met, its power was above the Pope. St. James, in the first Great Council in the Acts, did not publish its decrees in the name of St. Peter, but in that of the Council. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[q]

There was no outward disturbance in the seeming amity between the Emperor and the Pope; they appeared together in public; all was mutual deference and respect. The Pope knew the necessities of the Emperor. The great weakness of the Empire was the utter inadequacy of the Imperial revenues to the dignity of the station. The more magnificent or ambitious the Emperor, the more difficult, often degrading, was the struggle with his narrow finances. Sigismund aspired to be amongst the most splendid of sovereigns; his enemies scoffed at the mean artifices to which he was reduced to maintain that splendour. The Pope made a skilful attempt to avail himself of his weakness; he offered him a grant, or donative, or subsidy of 200,000 florins. But Sigismund was too deeply pledged, too resolutely determined; he had set his fame on the union and reform of the Church. He could not but refuse the tempting lure.[r] From the lordly prelates of Germany he might easily raise such a sum.

The Council at first had been hardly more than an assemblage of Italian Cardinals and Prelates; it had filled gradually, but rapidly, from all parts of Europe. The

[q] "Ubi non ait, placuit Petro, sed placuit nobis collectis in unum; et sequitur, 'Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis.'"—Read the sermon, in Von der Hardt, i. 436, 450.

[r] Sigismund came "mit Warnung, er soll, von Johann die 200,000 Gulden ja nicht nehmen: diese Summa könne man von den reichen Bischofen Teutschlands leicht bekommen."—J. Muller, Geschichte von Schweitz, aus Handschriften der Bibliothek von Wien. John de Monterolis, a bitter enemy of Sigismund, ascribes his hostility to John to the Pope's refusal of this sum. John was not likely to refuse it.—Apud Martene et Durand, t. ii. p. 1444.

first to appear before the arrival of the Emperor had been the Cardinal of Cambray, Peter d'Ailly, accompanied by many French Prelates; others came soon after. The Cardinal of Cambray took the lead of all the Transalpine Prelates, as Zabarella, Cardinal of Florence, of the Italian. All the rest did homage to their superior learning, abilities, and virtues. It was not till three months afterwards that the more learned and not less pious Chancellor Gerson appeared at the head of the deputies from the University of Paris. The French prelates and divines formed, in modern phrase, the constitutional party: they adhered with the severest orthodoxy to the Catholic doctrines; they admitted the supremacy of the Pope, but not an absolute autocracy. That supremacy was limited, not only by the College of Cardinals, but by the universal voice of the Church. A General Council was above the Pope. Beyond this the Church of France stood on some of her peculiar rights and privileges, which the Pope could not infringe or abrogate. There was a law and prerogative superior to the Pope. The Gallican Church is already asserting her liberties; her antagonism is hardly yet on distinct or defined grounds, but still it is antagonism. And all this bold assertion of superiority or independence was while a lunatic was on the throne of France; while Henry of England was in the heart of the land, one year before the battle of Agincourt.

The English, at least Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, the representative of their Church and of the insular character, were likewise as yet rigidly attached to the old traditional faith. With him the Teutonic independence of thought had not advanced farther than the strong impatience, which had long brooded in England, of the Papal tyranny, and its encroachment on the power of the State and of the nation. Throughout Hallam was the right hand of the Emperor, as asserting the civil supremacy. He alone took a high moral tone: to him a wicked Pope was but a wicked man. There was an unconscious Wycliffism in the Bishop, who would perhaps hardly have hesitated to have burned Wycliffe himself.

The English: Robert Hallam.

The powerful hierarchy of Germany did not hold its proper rank in the Council of Constance. Of the three great electoral prelacies, Cologne was vacant and contested. Treves was still in the obedience of Gregory XII.[s] Mentz appeared, but Archbishop John of Nassau was more fitted to shine in a camp than in a Council. He entered Constance at the head of a splendid and numerous retinue, in military attire, with helmet, cuirass, and boots of iron. His jealousy of the Emperor attached him recklessly to the cause of Pope John. The more remote kingdoms, Prussia, Poland, Hungary, sent their Archbishops, Posen, Riga, Gnesen, Colocz, and Canitz. There were two Danish Bishops, Kypen and Schleswig. Germans.

The total number of Clergy, not perhaps all present at one time,[t] was four Patriarchs, Constantinople, Grado, Antioch, Aquileia; twenty-nine Cardinals, Italians by birth, excepting five Frenchmen, chiefly of the creation of Benedict XIII., and one Portuguese; thirty-three Archbishops; about one hundred and fifty Bishops,[u] including thirty-two titulars; one hundred and thirty-four Abbots; two hundred and fifty Doctors; one hundred and twenty-five Provosts, and other superiors. With their whole attendance the Clergy amounted to eighteen thousand.

If the German hierarchy were less fully or rather less effectively represented, Germany alone sent her Princes to this Diet-Council, the Prince Palatine, Louis of Heidelberg, the Dukes Louis and Henry of Bavaria. The Palatine headed the embassy of France. The Burgraves John and Frederick of Nuremburg, the latter Margrave of Brandenberg; Rodolf, Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Baden.

All the great Free Cities sent their deputies. Over their doors the arms of their cities were ostentatiously displayed, as taking rank among sovereigns.[x]

[s] Cologne and Treves were, it seems, present by deputy.

[t] The numbers vary, perhaps on that account.

[u] The English Bishops were Bath, Hereford, Salisbury, Bangor; later, Winchester, London, Lichfield, Norwich.

[x] See Reichenthal (Augsburg, 1483) reprinted in later collections, a kind of King-at-arms. He has left a chronicle of what may be called the State proceedings. See on Reichenthal, L'Enfant, Preface, p. xxxii.

Ordinarily 50,000, at certain periods at least 100,000 persons and 30,000 horses were kept in ease and plenty; 30,000 beds were provided by the city. Four Imperial Commissioners regulated the price of provisions, which throughout were abundant, and at moderate cost. The police regulations were excellent; the garrison was but of 2000 men; to the last, as at first, no disturbance, no riot took place during the Council. This is the universal testimony.

CHAPTER IX.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. JOHN XXIII. JOHN HUSS.

POPE JOHN opened the year with a magnificent religious ceremony; he appeared amid the assembled myriads in the most solemn function of the Church as the acknowledged head of Christendom, almost for the last time! The sermon of the Cardinal of Cambray had not been the only sign of the danger that was looming over him. In the first General Congregation the Emperor had solemnly sworn to take the Pope under his sovereign protection.[a] So far the Pope and the Cardinals had heard with satisfaction; but he also avowed his expectation that the Legates of the two rival Pontiffs would be admitted to the Council. This was to sever the link which bound the Council of Constance to the Council of Pisa; it disclaimed the authority of Pisa if it recognised as Popes those who had been there deposed. A Parisian divine, Matthew Roder, had delivered a sermon in which he suggested the election of a new Pontiff.[b]

A.D. 1416.

Threatening signs against Pope John. Dec. 29.

But that act of the Emperor, which might seem least connected with the fate of Pope John, was in fact no doubt to his own sagacity, at once the direst omen and the immediate cause of his fall. The Emperor consented to violate his own safe-conduct, to abandon John Huss. The Bohemian was, with the consent of Sigismund, committed to closer custody. It was understood that he was to be tried by the Council, doomed by the Council, and that whatever might be the sentence of the Council, it would be carried into execution by the secular arm. The Council was thus relieved from all further debate on that question: it was out of

The Emperor abandons John Huss.

[a] Von der Hardt, iv. p. 31.

[b] L'Enfant, i. p. 79.

the way of their ulterior proceedings; the rock on which they might have split was avoided; their onward course was straight, clear, open.

Breach of faith admits no excuse; perfidy is twice perfidious in an Emperor. Yet it is but justice to Sigismund fairly to state the inextricable difficulty of his position. He had to choose between the violation of faith to one whom he himself no doubt esteemed a dangerous and turbulent heretic, and, it might be, the dissolution of the Council. With the Council he abandoned all the hopes on which he had rested his fame, his influence, his authority, the restoration of peace to the Church, the reformation of the Church. Huss was already arraigned as a heretic; the Pope, the Cardinals, the Council, had committed themselves to that arraignment. According to the view of almost the whole hierarchy, and the prelates of every nation, the suppression of heresy was their first imperious duty: it was the deepest and most passionate vow of every high-churchman; and which of them on such a point was not a high-churchman? Arguments were ready, which, on the principles dominant and long admitted in those days, it was not easy to parry or confute. The Emperor had no right to protect heretics, over whom throughout the world, and in every part of it, the hierarchy, especially such a council of the hierarchy, had indefeasible cognisance, could proceed, and were bound to proceed, according to the canons of the Church. And the fatal doctrine, confirmed by long usage, by the decrees of Pontiffs, by the assent of all ecclesiastics, and the acquiescence of the Christian world, that no promise, no oath, was binding to a heretic, had hardly been questioned, never repudiated.

Had Sigismund with a high hand released the prisoner; had he in the slightest degree infringed on the recognised province of the hierarchy, their sole adjudication in causes of heresy, Pope John might either have lengthened out an interminable discussion, or, if he had broken up the Council, or left it himself, he would have carried with him probably all the Italian Cardinals, and thrown an irreconcileable schism among the rest of the prelates. He would have become the champion of a great cause, a popular

cause with the whole hierarchy, and with all under the immediate influence of the hierarchy.

Sigismund yielded, perhaps not without self-reproach, certainly not without remonstrance which must have galled a man of his high feeling to the quick. The Bohemian lords, the Burgrave of Prague and others, had already written a strong demand, which arrived about this time, for the liberty of John Huss. He had been proclaimed, as they averred, by Conrad Archbishop of Prague, under his seal, guiltless of the slightest word of heresy. A second still more vigorous protest had followed, on his removal from the Dominican Convent, against this flagrant violation of public faith. "They would deeply grieve if they should hear that his august Majesty was polluted by such an enormous iniquity. Every one hereafter would spurn and despise an Imperial safe-conduct." [c]

The sacrifice of Huss (and now that perfidious sacrifice was resolved) established perfect harmony between the Emperor and the whole reforming part of the Council. Notwithstanding all the remonstrance of the Pope and his partisans, it was immediately determined to receive the ambassadors of the Antipopes, if armed with full powers, and to admit them with full recognition of their dignity into the Council. Those of Benedict presented themselves first, but not being provided with full powers, they were contemptuously rejected by the Emperor.[d] Their proposal, however, that Benedict XIII. and the King of Arragon should hold a conference with the Emperor at Nice, was not absolutely discarded. A few days after presented themselves the Archbishop of Ragusa and the other Legates of Gregory XII. They had been preceded by Louis Count Palatine, the delegates of the Archbishop of Treves, and the Bishops of Worms, Spires, and Verden, who still adhered to his obedience. The ambassadors, under this powerful support, were received with courteous honour; they declared their master, Gregory XII., prepared at once to resign the

January.

Reception of Deputies from Antipopes.

[c] Von der Hardt, iv. p. 33.

[d] "Do ward der König zornig, und sprach zu ihnen, den Boten des Peter Luna, nescio vos."—Justinger, Berner Chronik. 291, cited by Aschbach, p. 46.

Papacy on condition that Benedict and John did the same; that no one of the three should preside in the Council.[e]

John's cession demanded.

The demand for the cession of John, which had been at first a low and timid murmur, became the general clamour. Notwithstanding intrigues, bribes, promises, menaces, his partisans fell off daily.[f] Some appealed to his higher feelings; some uttered more or less disguised threats. The ambassador of Poland, Andrew Lascaris, Archbishop elect of Posen, urged his free abdication as a generous sacrifice for the peace of the Church. The Cardinal of St. Mark, in a writing communicated to the Council, the Emperor, and the Pope, urged upon John XXIII., that the stronger his grounds to be recognised as lawful Pope, the greater was his obligation to make this noble oblation for the good of the Church.[g] He more than hinted the power of the Council to enforce abdication.[h] John's Italian Cardinals raised a loud cry, that it was almost, if not absolute, heresy to put the Pope on the same footing with those deposed at Pisa.[i] The Cardinal d'Ailly at length summed up the whole in the fatal sentence, "The Universal Church, represented by a General Council, has full power to depose even a lawful Pontiff of blameless character, if it be necessary for the welfare of the Church."[k]

But these two Cardinals, Cambray and St. Mark, were preparing a measure still more disastrous to the Pope. The right of suffrage in an Œcumenic Council was by no means fixed and certain. In most of the later Councils the aristocratic principle had prevailed. No one below the Bishop or the Abbot had presumed to the right of voting on such high and mysterious matters. The Council of Pisa had admitted the right of professors and doctors of theology. The Pope, who knew his own strength, in the first session of the Council of Constance had rejected this claim. The Cardinal d'Ailly, in a memorial to the Council, not only asserted the right of these learned men to free suffrage, but demanded it for princes and ambassadors in all matters not directly concerning the faith. The

[e] Aschbach, p. 47.
[f] Von der Hardt, ii. 478, 479.
[g] Ibid. ii. 178, *et seqq.*
[h] Ibid. ii. 209.
[i] Ibid. ii. 213.
[k] L'Enfant, i. p. 105.

Cardinal of St. Mark went still further; he asserted the right of the lower clergy. "Was the Council not to profit by the profound learning of doctors in civil or canon law, and the wisest of the clergy?" "An ignorant prince or prelate," he said in coarse phrase, "is but a crowned ass. Is one entrusted with the cure of souls in a large parish less able to judge than the abbot who rules a few monks?"

The first proposition wrested the superiority in the Council from the hands of the Pope. The Italian Bishops were numerous and poor. Fear, interest, nationality, contempt of Transalpine barbarians, bound them to the service of the Pope. But this was not the worst or most menacing proposal. Already, according to the usage of most Universities, the Congregations, which prepared the business for the general Sessions of the Council, had met in Nations. The prelates, doctors, and ambassadors of the four great powers assembled each in a separate chamber, with a President changing every month, a secretary, notaries, and other officers. The Nations were: I. The Italians; II. The Germans, comprehending the Poles, Hungarians, Danes, and Scandinavians; III. The French; IV. The English. At a later period the Spaniards, who had not yet joined the Council, formed a fifth Nation. It was proposed to vote by Nations; and this decree, which reduced the Italians to a single suffrage, notwithstanding the Pope's remonstrance, passed with irresistible acclamation. Feb. 7.

Pope John was in the toils; his most obstinate struggles only drew around him more closely the galling meshes. The subtle Italians found themselves circumvented by the steady aggression of the Tramontanes. Now came a more tremendous blow. A memoir was secretly presented to the Council, it was presumed by an Italian, with a full and darkly-coloured statement of the detestable wickednesses, the vices and crimes of the Pope's whole life.[1] The more noble-minded of the Germans and Charges against the Pope.

[1] "Quidam, ut præsumitur, Italicus, multos articulos valde famosos, et omnia peccata mortalia, nec non impacta quodammodo abominabilia continentes, contra eundem Balthasarem, in eodem Concilio exhibuit in scriptis tamen secretè, quod super illis contra eundem Balthasarem fieret inquisitio, et provideretur instanter per Concilium memoratum."—A Niem, p. 25.

the Poles recoiled from the scandalous exposure. They refused the public inquisition into these articles, as degrading to the Roman See, as throwing a fatal slur on all the Prelates and dignitaries promoted by the Pope. They generously insisted on its suppression. But these sinister tidings did not escape the Pope, who had his secret intelligence of the most trivial proceedings in the Council. He was struck with utter consternation.[m] He summoned the Cardinals: he denied much, but he admitted some of the charges. He heaped upon them gifts and promises: he proposed desperately to confront the Council; to make ample confession, and to stand on the great principle, that a Pope could not be deposed but for heresy. The Cardinals coldly advised him not to be precipitate, but to take some days to mature his determination.

His adversaries pursued their advantage. While the Pope was quailing under this peril, deputies appeared before him to persuade him to the cession of the Papacy. To their surprise and joy, the Pope consented; he drew up himself a form which was submitted to the Nations. But every word of the Papal form was scrutinised with the most suspicious jealousy. It was thought vague and ambiguous; doubtful pretensions, doubtful meanings lurked under its artful phrases. There was a long discussion. The Pope presented a second form; it was rejected. A third, proposed by the Emperor, was repudiated by the Pope. At that instant arrived the Delegates from the University of Paris, with the famous Gerson at their head. All did homage to the high authority of this learned body, and their world-renowned Chancellor. A new form was prepared, it was supposed under the direction of Gerson, and presented by the Emperor with more peremptory demand of acceptance. The Pope stifled his grief, tried every subterfuge, raised every subtle objection; but the three nations,

The Pope determines to abdicate. Feb. 16.

Feb. 18.

m "Quibus etiam interim clanculo et proditorie ad notitiam dicti Balthasaris deductis, illico mente consternatus est, et cœpit valde tremere et timere ac etiam quosdam sibi secreto Cardinales, et de quibus fiduciam habuit donis ac promissis allicere et consulere quid esset in eâ parte pro ejus honoris conservatione facturus, asserens, quod quædam in ipsis articulis descripta, tanquam homo, peccando commisisset, et aliqua non."—Ibid.

the Germans, the French, and the English held resolutely together; the Italians supported him with but feeble fidelity. The one alteration admitted only made the words more stringent, severe, not to be eluded. In his despair he assumed a kind of sullen magnanimity. A general Congregation was summoned; the Emperor and the Deputies of all the Nations were present. The March 1. form was offered to the Pope by the Patriarch of Antioch. He read it to himself, and seemed to ponder over it. None of the bitterness of his heart betrayed itself in his countenance. With a calm clear voice he read publicly the irrevocable words: "I, Pope John XXIII., for the repose of the whole Christian people, profess, Pope's cession. engage, promise, swear, and vow to God, the Church, and this holy Council, willingly and freely to give peace to the Church, by the way of my simple cession of the Papacy; to do and to fulfil this effectually, according to the determination of this present Council, when and so soon as Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, called in their respective obediences Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., shall in like manner cede the Papacy, to which they pretend, by themselves or by their lawful Proctors: and even in any case of vacancy by decease or otherwise, in which by my cession unity can be restored to the Church of God through the extirpation of the present Schism."

Ere he closed, the whole Assembly broke out into a paroxysm of rapture. The Emperor, the Cardinals, the Deputies of the Nations and of the University of Paris crowded round the throne, all rendering thanks. Te Deum was sung; the chant was interrupted by tears of joy; more wept than sang.[n]

The next day was the second public Session. The Pope himself celebrated Mass. At its close he March 2. took his seat before the altar, with his face to the Council, and read the same form handed to him by the Patriarch of Antioch. At the words, "I swear and vow," he knelt before the altar, clasped his hands together, and uttered the words "Thus I promise," with profound solemnity. He returned to his chair, and concluded the

[n] Von der Hardt and L'Enfant throughout.

service. The Emperor advanced, took off his crown, threw himself at the feet of the Pope, and kissed them, expressing his fervent gratitude. So did the Patriarch of Antioch in the name of the Council.

Two days had hardly passed, when dark mutual suspicions began to transpire. Each party had ulterior views. Pope John had manifestly the hope that by his frank and full confession he might propitiate the Council; perhaps. be able to throw on his competitors the odium of refusing these equal terms; or he might delude himself with fonder expectations. The Council felt that he was at their mercy, and were disposed to clench rather than relax their iron grasp. They had determined to press the conditional into an absolute abdication. This dire reality broke gradually but rapidly upon the Pope. First they demanded a Bull, declaring his abdication according to the customary form. The Pope treated this proposition as an insult, and haughtily repelled the Prelates from his presence: they dared not venture again on this perilous subject. But to the Emperor he was less intractable. Sigismund extorted from him a Bull, still, indeed, guarded in its language.

March 5. John renewed his sacred promise; but his abdication yet depended on the simultaneous abdication of his rivals. The next demand was more insidious, more imperious, more embarrassing. Of the two rival Popes, most respect was paid to Benedict XIII. He had still a King, the King of Arragon, for his partisan. It had been proposed that the Emperor and the King of Arragon, accompanied by Benedict, should meet at Nice. John was required to invest ambassadors with full powers to execute his abdication at the same instant with that of Benedict. Of these ambassadors the Emperor was to be one. With such irrevocable powers Pope John would have delivered himself bound hand and foot into the hands of Sigismund.

This proposal was made in a full Congregation by the Germans, French, and English; it was indig-

March 9. nantly rejected by the Pope supported by the Italian Prelates. The Italians threatened to leave the Council if such rigorous demands were urged further.

Yet there was still the most bland and respectful outward amity. The next day the Pope presented to the Emperor the Golden Rose. That mysterious gift, according to Pope Innocent III.,[o] represented by its gold, its odour, and its balm, the Godhead, the Body and Soul of the Redeemer. It was only bestowed by Popes on Sovereigns the most loyal servants of the Church. The Emperor received it with words of the most devout gratefulness. They dined together. The Emperor offered the consecrated Rose in the Church of the Virgin Mary.

The very next day, whether there was a deep latent hypocrisy under this seeming amity; whether the Emperor had discovered treachery in the Pope, and that he already meditated flight; or that he thought it no longer worth while to dissemble his uncompromising hostility, the proposal was openly made to elect a new Pope. This proposition in itself proclaimed John XXIII. no longer Pope; it assumed the power in the Council of deposing him, and of proceeding to another choice. Among the vague, fond hopes of John had been that he himself might be re-elected to the Pontificate. Such had been the design of his more stedfast partisans. The warlike Archbishop of Mentz declared that he would never render allegiance but to John. Words ran high; the suppressed charges against the abominable life of the Pope were revived in their unmitigated blackness. Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, at the head of the English, had already espoused the Emperor's cause, and had urged unswervingly the searching reformation of all orders in the Church. The honest islander broke out in righteous indignation, that the Pope deserved to be burned at the stake.

March 10.

Proposal for a new Pope.

All confidence was now at an end. It was notorious that Pope John meditated escape: and should he escape, would boldly appeal to Christendom against the decrees of a headless Council. The Council was determined that he should not leave the city. An attempt was made by the Cardinal St. Angelo to pass the gates; he was rudely

[o] Innocent III., Prædicatio, see Hurter. Compare also Durand, Rationale, vi. 121.

arrested by the burgher guard. The Pope loudly complained of the violation of the Imperial safe-conduct, that safe-conduct which in the case of John Huss he had trampled under foot. The Magistrates of Constance threw the blame on the orders of the Emperor. Frederick of Austria alone declared that he at least would respect the person and liberty of the Pope.[p]

Another Congregation of the Nations was held; the Italians stood aloof. It was resolved to urge the Pope at once to appoint plenipotentiaries to execute his abdication, and that the Emperor should be one of these plenipotentiaries. They further required the Pope to give security that he would neither leave the Council, nor adjourn it to any other place. The Emperor excused the rigid watch, now avowedly maintained at the gates of the city, by declaring that it was on account of the notorious design of many Cardinals clandestinely to leave Constance. It was his duty to prevent this unauthorised dissolution of the Council.

March 15.

The Pope yielded to this last demand, the promise not to dissolve or adjourn the Council till the end of the Schism, and to do everything he could to promote the restoration of unity. This was a promise which, were it in his power, he could without difficulty violate or elude. But the immediate fatal step of authorizing others to execute his abdication, he refused with stubborn obstinacy. "He had no proof that Angelo Corario had resigned; he had only heard that Peter di Luna would resign."

The gloom which was gathering round John was broken by a faint but transient gleam of hope. The French Cardinals began to relent, to murmur at his harsh usage. The Italians seized the opportunity, and endeavoured to detach them from the hostile league. They began to revive the question of voting by voices, not by Nations. The Germans and the English adhered to each other in resolute hostility to the Pope. In the French, the hatred and jealousy of the English, fostered by their long, cruel, and humiliating wars, struggled with their zeal for the unity, and for the reform of the Church.

Quarrel in the Council.

[p] Cerretanus, apud Von der Hardt, iv. 55.

The Cardinals, as Italian Prelates, sate with the Italian nation. The Five, the Cardinal of Cambray at their head, were deputed to persuade the French nation to milder measures. The Germans and English held only the more closely together, and were more inflexibly resolved by this opposition. The Bishop of Salisbury boldly proposed that if the Pope refused to appoint his Procurators, he should be put under arrest. The Emperor and his supporters of the other two Nations presented themselves in the French Congregation, and laid before them the result of their deliberations. The French insisted that they should withdraw. Sigismund broke out in a wrathful menace: "Now will be shown who are for the unity of the Church and for the Empire." March 19.
The Cardinal of Cambray indignantly retired; the other four Cardinals protested against the violation of the liberty of debate. The Emperor answered that the word had escaped him in passion, that the French had perfect liberty, but the Cardinals were Italians, not French; if they withdrew not to their own chamber, he threatened them with imprisonment.

The quarrel, the Pope's last desperate hope, was appeased by the skilful influence of the ambassadors of France, especially by Duke Louis of Bavaria.

Late the following evening, after vespers, Sigismund visited the Pope; he found him reclining on his bed, somewhat indisposed. John complained of the oppressive air of Constance, he required change.[q] Interview of the Emperor and the Pope. March 19.
The Emperor earnestly dissuaded him from leaving Constance before the close of the Council, above all, not clandestinely. "This would be to his eternal dishonour." He declared himself prepared to maintain his safe-conduct inviolable, but he had not power to permit him to depart from the city. The Pope answered in ambiguous phrase, that he would not quit Constance till the dissolution of the Council.[r] Many other rumours spread abroad of what took place at this memorable interview. The Emperor

[q] Theodoric à Niem here breaks out into praise of the salubrity of Constance. A Niem, 27.

[r] "Credens forte, quod eo recedente, abhinc illud dissolveretur omnino."—

had demanded, or the Pope had offered, large sums for his liberty, under pretence of the great expense of maintaining the Council. The Pope, by one account, refused to buy the Emperor or to sell the Council. The Bishop of Salisbury, said to have been present, asserted to the face of the Pope the superiority of the Council over the Pope. The Pope kept no reserve. As soon as the Emperor had departed, to his attendants he taunted Sigismund as a drunkard, a fool, a madman, and a beggar.[8]

Frederick of Austria.

All this time the plot for his escape had been laid and fully matured. Frederick, Duke of Austria, had been a month in Constance, a month of humiliation and aggravation of his hatred towards the Emperor. He had been compelled to do homage for all his fiefs. He had attempted to delude the Emperor into favouring a breach of the peace which he had sworn to the Swiss Cantons. The Emperor, more crafty than himself, had betrayed him to the Swiss. Delegates from the Cantons and cities had exposed the Duke's perfidy before the Emperor. That Frederick of Austria was in secret communication with the Pope, all suspected. The Emperor admonished the Duke concerning the peril of these intrigues. Frederick solemnly protested his innocence.

March 20. Flight of the Pope.

The afternoon of the very day after the interview with the Pope, the Duke of Austria had proclaimed a splendid tournament without the gates of the city. Himself was to joust with the young Count of Cilly, brother of the Empress. All Constance thronged forth to the spectacle; the streets were desert. Pope John, in the dress of a groom, with a grey cloak, and a kerchief wrapt close over his face, mounted a wretched ill-accoutred horse, with a cross-bow on the pommel of his saddle. He passed the gates unperceived, unchallenged, and rode about two hours to Ermatingen, at the efflux of the Rhine from the Lake of Constance. A boat was ready, he glided down the rapid stream to Schaffhausen, the castle of which was a stronghold of the Duke of Austria. Tidings were whispered in the ear of the Duke in the very act of his tournay. He

[8] A Niem, ibid.

continued the contest a short time, then courteously ceded the prize to his adversary De Cilly; in the evening he rode with a few attendants to Schaffhausen.

The news of the Pope's flight spread like wildfire.[t] The streets of Constance were thronged with prelates, priests, and populace, some in dismay, some in undisguised joy. A few Italians and Austrians stole out of the gates, and took to flight. The rabble broke into the palace from which the Pope had fled, to assert their privilege of plunder. The goldsmiths, moneychangers, traders shut their shops.[u] The Burgomaster called the inhabitants to arms; the imperial soldiery occupied the principal streets and squares. The adversaries of the Pope were appalled. Some declared the Council actually dissolved by the departure of the Pope. The superstitious shuddered at the ban which no doubt the Pope would hurl at the devoted city and the contumacious Council. Five Cardinals in the confusion stole away to the Pope.

In the morning the Emperor rode through the streets with the Count Palatine, Louis of Bavaria, and a long retinue of princes and nobles. He allayed the tumult among the people by the assurance of his protection to their liberties and properties. He summoned the Princes, Cardinals, Prelates, Ambassadors; he declared his resolute determination with all his power, and at the hazard of his life, to maintain the authority of the assembly. He exhorted them not to disquiet themselves on account of the Pope's flight. The fathers of the Council resolved to send ambassadors to summon the Pope to return, and to commission plenipotentiaries for his absolute cession. These ambassadors were the Cardinals Orsini, St. Mark, Saluces, with the Archbishop of Rheims.

Pope John, almost immediately on his arrival at Schaffhausen, had written letters to the Council. "By the grace of God Almighty I have arrived at Schaffhausen, where I enjoy liberty and breathe air suited to the state of my health. I have come hither without

The Pope's Letter.

[t] Von der Hardt. Almost all the authorities are collected, and references made to the rest.—Vol. iv. pp. 59, 66.

[u] This can hardly be called a riot, or a breach of the boasted peace in Constance.

the knowledge of my son, the Duke of Austria,[x] not to dispense myself from the promise of abdicating the Papacy in favour of the Church of God, but to execute it with greater freedom, as well as for the recovery of my health."

The letter of the Pope was treated as an audacious falsehood. On the walls of the palace at Constance was affixed a terrible writing, proclaiming the Pope Antichrist, denouncing his base and perfidious arts and cajoleries, and those of the Cardinals, in order to dissolve the Council, recounting all his crimes, tyrannies, murders, simonies, sordid merchandise of the Church; calling on the Council to proceed against him, and to depose him at once from his throne. The Emperor in a full assembly arraigned the Duke of Austria as a perfidious traitor to the Church, the Council, and the Empire. Not a voice was raised in his defence.

The Council supreme.

The Council was now to proclaim itself the supreme, indefeasible, independent authority of Christendom. In the assertion of these new principles, which changed the Church from an autocracy to an aristocracy, the lead was taken by the French Nation, by the Chancellor Gerson, the voice of that Nation; but with the full concurrence of the Germans, the English, even of the Italians except the Cardinals. The Cardinals, as the Privy Council of the Pope, refused to be present, and sanction doctrines limitary if not subversive of the Papal power.

Gerson's maxims.

Gerson laid down twelve great revolutionary maxims. Among them that Jesus Christ himself was the one primal and perfect Head of the Church, the Pope so only in a secondary sense; the union of Christ as the Spouse with his Church was alone indissoluble, that of the Pope might be dissolved; a Pope is necessary to complete the Church, but any particular Pope may be removed; the Church, or an Œcumenic Council representing the Church, is under the direction of the Holy Ghost, it may enact canons which the Pope is bound to obey, and cannot annul; a Council can be assembled in some cases without the authority even of a legitimate Pope; the

[x] "Inscio filio meo Duce Austriæ."—Schaffhausen, March 21.

Council can command the cession of a Pope for the welfare of the Church, or the termination of a schism; the reformation of the Church both in faith and discipline rests ultimately with the Council; Councils ought to be held from time to time, as the one supreme, irrefragable representative of the Church.[y]

The Pope was not idle at Schaffhausen; he summoned all his officers and the whole Papal Court to attend upon him.[z] He published an appeal addressed to the French; he hoped to touch their pride and their jealousy of the Germans and English. Among his first and bitterest charges was their refusal to proceed at once to the extirpation of heresy in the person of John Huss. He complained of the division of the Council into four Nations, by which the French and Italians—by far the most numerous and learned—were reduced to the level of the English and the Germans; of the extension of the suffrage, which had ever been confined to Cardinals, Prelates, and the Hierarchy; of its usurpation by laymen as by priests, married and unmarried, ignorant and erudite. This turbulent rabble had hissed down grave Cardinals. His undoubted presidency of the Council had been usurped by the Emperor. He complained of the tyranny and force exercised by the Emperor; the insults to his person—jousts had been celebrated under his windows, with intolerable clang of trumpets. He complained of the insolence of the English, who had threatened him with arrest, especially Robert Hallam of Salisbury. The most extraordinary paragraph was that in which he gave himself the lie,

The Pope at Schaffhausen.

[y] Gerson had already promulgated these doctrines in a more contemptuous and offensive form. He had raised the Imperial power high above the Papal. "If an hereditary monarch may be deposed, how much more an elective! If an Emperor descended from a long unbroken royal lineage, how much more the son of a Venetian fisherman, whose father and grandfather had not beans enough to fill their stomachs! The Pope ought to be more easily deposed than another prelate. If the Pope sins, all partake of his sin; not so if a bishop. The canons on which rests the Papal authority were framed by fraud and craft." Gerson throws disdainfully aside the 6th book of Decretals and the Clementines. "What is a Pope? A man! the son of a man! clay of clay! a sinner, liable to sin! Two days before the son of a poor peasant, he is raised to be Pope. Is he then above repentance, confession, contrition? a sinless angel? a saint?" Wycliffe himself gives not a more awful catalogue of Papal crimes than this doughty churchman. "He is not above the Gospel."—Apud Von der Hardt, i. p. 76, *et seqq.*; et Oper. vol. ii. p. 162, *et seqq.* Tractatus pertinentes ad Concilium Constantianense.

[z] Von der Hardt, ii. 153.

and now asserted that his flight was with the aid of the Duke of Austria.[a] He wrote to the King of France and the Duke of Orleans in the same strain; it was his hope to enlist them in his cause against the Emperor, whom he represented as exercising a cruel tyranny over the Council.

The Pope at Schaffhausen was almost as much at the mercy of his enemies as at Constance. Could he have crossed the Alps, followed as he would have been by some of the Cardinals, and appealed to the loyalty and anti-Ghibellinism of some of the Guelfic cities, he might possibly have maintained the contest. But he had neither strength nor courage. A Gregory VII. or a Gregory IX. would instantly have issued his ban against the perfidious Emperor, who had violated his own safe-conduct, and the contumacious Council. He would have declared the assumption of supreme power by the Council an impious affront to St. Peter, a denial of Christ in his Vicar; he would have laid half Christendom under an Interdict, and placed before the hierarchy the alternative of forfeiting or endangering their own authority, or asserting that of the Pope. But John XXIII. wanted faith in himself and in his office. The truth, no doubt, of some of the damning charges against his life weighed heavily on his spirit, and no one could discern with more sagacity how much in the course of things, and through the long Schism, the old awe had fallen away from the name of the Pope. He was embarrassed, too, by the services of his now avowed ally, the Duke of Austria. The Emperor eagerly seized the opportunity of crushing his refractory and hated vassal. The Pope could not abandon Frederick to his wrath, his only refuge was an Austrian castle. His other great partisan, the Archbishop of Mentz, had not dared to own his complicity in the flight; he had retired to his own city, and Mentz was too far from Italy, too deep in Germany to offer an asylum. The whole conduct, therefore, of John was that of timidity, vacillation, tergiversation. His object was to detach the Cardinals from the Council, to gather them round himself, and to obtain for the Pope and the Sacred College that

John's conduct.

[a] Apud Von der Hardt, ii. 257.

respect which the Pope alone had irrecoverably lost. The Archbishop of Rheims returned before the other ambassadors of the Council, with a proposition to appoint the Cardinals collectively, with four Bishops, one of each Nation, Bath, Lebus (in Poland), Narbonne (the Italian was not named), the Procurators for his absolute cession.

The proceedings of the Council, on the other hand, were resolute, aggressive, imperious. Congregation after Congregation, and two Sessions of the whole Council, were held between the Pope's flight and the end of the month. At every meeting there was the same scornful rejection of all the Pope's advances, the same inflexible determination to vindicate their own superior authority. The Cardinals were divided, perplexed; they could not support, they would not abandon the Pope; with his integral authority fell theirs; they could not acknowledge, they dared not defy the Council. Hence at the First General Session after the flight two only were present, one French, the Cardinal of Cambray, one Venetian, St. Mark. Proceedings of the Council. March 26.

Yet the Council without the Cardinals appeared wanting in dignity. After much stormy discussion in the Congregations, the memorable Fourth Session of the Council was summoned for the 31st March. The President (the Cardinal of Naples, an Orsini) took his seat: on one side was Sigismund the Emperor, and the hierarchy in their ranks; on the other the great laymen, Ambassadors, Princes, Dukes, and Counts. The resolutions, the final fatal resolutions, agreed upon the day before, or averred by one party to have been agreed upon at a full Congregation of the Nations, were placed in the hands of Zabarella, the Cardinal of Florence. He read in calm tone the Preface and the Decree:—"The said Council of Constance, lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, an Œcumenic Council, which represents the Catholic Church Militant, has received immediately from Jesus Christ power which every one of every estate and dignity, even Papal, is obliged to obey in all which regards the faith and the extirpation of the present Schism." Here the voice of the Cardinal faltered at the unexpected or un-

welcome words. He either refused to read on or read imperfectly, with faint and trembling accents, "and the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members." In the tumult which rose the two other resolutions were hardly heard. These declared that the Pope should not adjourn the Council from Constance to any other place, nor summon his Court to attend him elsewhere; that all promotions made by him from that time were null and void.

The Council would not permit the Cardinals to elude their stern determination. At a Fifth General Session, notwithstanding much altercation and strife with the Cardinals, the three Decrees were read fully, distinctly, dictatorially, by the Archbishop of Posen.[b] The Pope had not awaited this act: he had dropped down the Rhine to another strong fortress, Laufenberg. But his Cardinals and most of his Court refused to follow him; they returned in shame and contempt to Constance.

April 10.

Further flight of the Pope.

The rapid, total, and unpitied humiliation of the Duke of Austria left the Pope a miserable defenceless fugitive. On April 7th the ban of the Empire, the excommunication of the Council, were promulgated against this capital traitor. All his vassals were released from their sworn fealty; all treaties, contracts, oaths, vows, concerning the man excommunicated alike by the Church and by the Empire, were declared null and void. Whoever could conquer might possess the territory, the towns, the castles of the outlaw. The Swabian Princes fell on his possessions in Alsace; the Swiss Cantons (they only with some reluctance to violate solemn treaties) seized his hereditary dominions, even Hapsburg itself. The Duke of Upper Bavaria, the Bishops of Augsburg and Coire, the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Archbishop of Salzburg, Albert of Austria, the Count of Cilly, overran the Tyrol.

Humiliation of the Duke of Austria.

Before the month had expired, this powerful Duke was hardly permitted to humble himself in person before the Emperor, whose insatiate revenge spared nothing that could abase his ancient foe. It was a sup-

April 30.

[b] Von der Hardt, iv. 105.

pliant entreating pardon in the most abject terms, a Sovereign granting it with the most hard and haughty condescension. Frederick surrendered all his land and possessions to be held at the will of the Emperor, until he should deign to reinvest the Duke with them under the most degrading tenure of allegiance and fealty.

The Pope in the meantime had fled again in mean disguise to Fribourg in the Brisgau, a pleasant city, which still owned the dominion of the Duke of Austria. He had sent certain articles to the Council from Laufenberg; he sent others more ambiguous and unsatisfactory from Fribourg. The Council, while the Pope was thus sinking into despicable insignificance, was still rising in pretensions and power. An address to all Christendom vindicated their proceedings towards the Pope. "The King of the Romans (the Emperor), only at their request, had closed the gates to prevent some faithless Prelates from leaving the Council." "The Pope had deserted the Council after having deliberately sworn to maintain it. He had summoned his Cardinals and his Court to follow him in his ignominious flight, in order to dissolve the Council." As yet, however, there was no acrimonious persecution of the Pope. A mandate was issued by the Council prohibiting scurrilous and abusive libels against the Pontiff and the Court of Rome. A motion to refuse the Cardinals admission and the right of suffrage was rejected. The Pope at Fribourg.

The Pope had one wild hope: he had looked to France, to the King; he now looked to the Duke of Burgundy. Under his protection he meditated an escape to Avignon; to be nearer the Rhine he removed to Brisach; but the Duke of Burgundy had his reasons for declining to offend the Council. His own cause, Jean Petit's defence of his assassination of the Duke of Orleans, rested on their decision. Even Frederick of Austria was compelled to the hard terms of surrendering the Pope to the Council. At the Sixth Session instructions were given to deputies from the Council to compel the surrender of the Pope. They found him not at Fribourg; they followed him to Brisach. He promised an answer the next day; the next day he had disappeared. April 17. April 19. April 23.

The ensuing Session determined to cite the Pope, and proceed to the utmost extremity. The citation was fixed on the gates of the city, on the doors of all the churches. It summoned Pope John XXIII. to answer for the maintenance of the Schism, for heresy, simony, maladministration and notorious dilapidation of the estates and possessions of the Papacy; for the scandals and notorious criminalities of his life and conversation. A body of three hundred armed men, under Frederick of Nuremberg, were sent to seize the fugitive. In vain the Pope sent full powers to the Cardinals of Cambray, St. Mark, and Florence, to act in his behalf: the Cardinals refused to undertake the trust. The next day, the time assigned to the Pope for his appearance having expired, the Council proceeded in its course. Seventy articles were exhibited: never probably were seventy more awful accusations brought against man than against the Vicar of Christ. The Cardinal St. Mark made a feeble attempt to repel the charge of heresy; against the darker charges no one spoke a word. Before the final decree, sixteen of those of the most indescribable depravity were dropped, out of respect not to the Pope, but to public decency and the dignity of the office. On the remaining undefended fifty-four the Council gravely, deliberately, pronounced the sentence of deposition against the Pope.[c]

May 2.
May 13.
May 14.
Eleventh Session. May 25.

Weary, deserted by all, conscience-stricken, betrayed perforce by the Duke of Austria, pursued by the Imperial soldiers, John in his fall was without courage as without dignity. He had already been brought to Rodolfzell, and imprisoned in the castle under an Hungarian guard. On the first demand he yielded up the insignia of universal spiritual power, the Papal Seal, the Fisherman's Ring, the Book of Petitions.[d]

Surrender and imprisonment of the Pope. May 27.

[c] Among the sentences was "suis detestabilibus inhonestisque vitâ et moribus ecclesiam Dei et populum Christianum scandalisantem, ante ejus assumptionem ad Papatum et post usque ad ista tempora."—Apud Von der Hardt. I give one class of charges in the words of Gobelinus: "Item ipse graviter fuit infamatus, quod cum uxore fratris sui concubuerit; cum sanctimonialibus incestum, cum virginibus stuprum, et cum conjugatis adulterium perpetraverit, nec non alia flagitia, propter qualia ira Dei descendit in filios diffidentiæ."—P. 341. See the 6th article.

[d] Liber Supplicationum.

His sentence was read to him by two Cardinals. He acknowledged its justice, protested that he surrendered of his free will the Papal dignity, and would never attempt to resume it. This one vow John XXIII. religiously observed: he had neither opportunity nor temptation to break it. He was brought to the strong Castle of Gotleben, without the walls of Constance. To his sentence of deposition had been subjoined a sentence of imprisonment, at least for safe custody. He was afterwards committed to the charge of the Elector Palatine. The Castle of Heidelberg was assigned as his residence and his prison.

John Huss.

There was another prisoner in Gotleben, a man against whose life his worst enemies brought no word of reproach. John Huss had been for some months in irons pining in a dungeon of this fortress, under custody of the Bishop of Constance. To Huss the fall of the Pope, though it might seem to deliver him from his most implacable enemy, was fatal. His friends had fondly supposed that he would meet with more calm and equable justice, if not with favour, before a Council of which all the leading members had concurred in denouncing ecclesiastical abuses, the vices and ignorance of the clergy, in terms as strong and uncompromising as the Reformers of Bohemia, as Wycliffe himself: a Council which had ventured on so bold an innovation, a heresy so manifest according to the principles long dominant in Christendom, as to set itself above the Pope, to assume the power of deposing a Pope. Now too would appear in his proper character an Emperor whose noble ambition seemed to be the restoration of the Church to purity as well as to unity, under whose safe-conduct he had come to Constance. Sigismund had reluctantly yielded to the violation of that safe-conduct, and might now redeem his pledge, which the Pope had almost compelled him to forfeit.

Jerome of Prague.

So entirely were the friends of Huss under this delusion that Jerome of Prague, the second in influence and character among the Bohemian Reformers, had thought it a favourable opportunity to join his friend. Jerome, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Huss, had set out from Prague to share the dangers and to support the cause of his brother teacher of the truth. He entered

Constance secretly, without a safe-conduct. The Council issued a summons to him to appear within fourteen days. They offered full freedom of entrance into Constance; his departure must depend on their judgement in his cause. Jerome turned his face back towards Prague; but at Hirschau, in the Upper Palatinate, he rashly broke out, in the presence of many clergy, into denunciations against the Council. He was seized and sent prisoner to Constance.

Huss and his followers, in their infatuated expectations of leniency, or of respect for the freedom of such opinions as theirs, showed their ignorance of mankind, of the hierarchy, as well as of the bounds beyond which it was premature to attempt the emancipation of the religious mind of Europe. The leaders in the Council of Constance, the Cardinal d'Ailly, Gerson, still more the better Italian Cardinals, St. Mark and Zabarella of Florence, had no conception beyond a purely aristocratic and hierarchical reformation, which should restore its strength to the ecclesiastical system by raising the morals of the corrupt clergy and the ignorant monks and friars. But they would have shuddered with horror and indignation at the examination of any established doctrine, or even of any ancient ritual observance. They had not only the pride of ecclesiastical rank, but the pride of that learning which consisted in a laborious and masterly command of the vast and voluminous theology, and of the Canon Law, the established code of Christendom. They were conscientiously convinced that there was no knowledge, at least of religious things, beyond this circle. The most far-sighted might not perceive the full bearings, but they had an instinctive sagacity which shrunk from the democratic doctrines which had been preached by Wycliffe, and were partially, at the least, embraced by the Bohemian Reformers: their mistrust was more likely to exaggerate than diminish the danger. These doctrines without doubt called in question, and submitted to bold inquiry, some which were thought the fundamental articles of the dominant creed, withdrew in fact the ritual and the instruction of the Church from the sacred Latin, and vulgarised it into the national language. They already spoke of an authority to which all the the-

ology of the Church, which had been accumulating for centuries, and all the law of the Church (their proud possession), must submit, that of the Bible—the Bible translated and popularised for general use. Above all, they owned the great vital principle of Wycliffism, that the wicked or unworthy priest was no priest. Be he Pope, Cardinal, Bishop, Curate, or Friar, his vices absolutely annulled all his privileges, his immunities, his rights to his estates, his claim to tithes or church-dues. The efficacy of the Sacraments which he administered perplexed or divided the teachers of this bewildering doctrine.

It was in truth, in its broad enunciation, a specious and noble theory; but to the calmest, still more to the interested, the objections raised against Wycliffe could not but occur in appalling force. Without an infallible tribunal, without an omniscient Judge to pronounce sentence against the whole hierarchy or any individual priest, how impracticable, how iniquitous! Was this sentence to be intrusted for its award and execution to Kings coveting the wealth of the Church; to an ignorant populace, who knew not the difference between unchristian arrogance or the calm and holy severity of good Churchmen; or even to the honest but fanatic teachers of purer doctrines, usually as intolerant as those against whose intolerance they have risen up? In such a strife must fall law, order, property, government, the salutary restraints of religion.

John Huss and Jerome of Prague, as among the first distinguished martyrs for Christian liberty, and as condemned by a Council in the face of Christendom, have obtained perhaps importance, not fully recognised in their own day, assuredly not till after the Bohemian war. It could not be supposed that a great hierarchical Senate from the four most powerful kingdoms, indeed, from all Europe, with the Emperor, who took a pride in exalting its authority, at its head, a Council which had deposed Popes, would be bearded and defied by two or three contumacious priests from a remote, obscure, and half-barbarous land. The burning of heretics was now so completely part of the established usage of the Church, as to cause, if compassion, none of that revulsion of feeling which has happily grown into our Christianity. And it is but justice to the

Views of the Council.

"Fathers of Constance," as they are called, to admit that they tried all milder means of persuasion. Even the bitterest opponents of Huss, Michael de Causis and Stephen Palecz, earnestly besought him to make disavowal of his errors. The course of the Churchman seemed to him clear and determinate, and unavoidable. In the Emperor his pride and his honour, and even his interest, came into perilous collision with these opponents. Was he to recede before a simple Bohemian?—and Sigismund had an old hereditary grudge, as well as a German aversion, to Bohemia. He was beset on all sides. The Churchmen pressed him with the argument that he had gone beyond his powers in granting security to a heretic over whom the Church alone has jurisdiction. "He that is false to God, has no right to appeal to truth or faith."[e] The King of Arragon addressed a letter to Sigismund, taunting him with his manifest favour to a notorious heretic, and avowing astonishment that he had not long before done justice upon Huss. Yet, on the other hand, there still was his safe-conduct, full, distinct, not to be disavowed. He looked too, hereafter, to the succession to the throne of Bohemia. That kingdom had already sent another petition, almost imperious, expressing the sentiments of the magnates of the realm, and demanding the release of John Huss.

The Emperor.

The affair of Huss had been revived almost simultaneously with that of the deposition of Pope John. The Council seemed resolved, while it proceeded to extremities in one direction, to show to Christendom that it had no disposition to dangerous latitude on the other. Early in May, in a full Session of the Council (the Eighth), came forth a full condemnation of Wycliffe and his doctrines. During the imprisonment of Huss the controversy concerning the administration of the Cup to the laity had been renewed in Prague. The Curate of St. Michael in that city, James von Mies, commonly called Jacobel, had embarked in violent warfare with the opponents of this innovation. The Bishop of Lieutomyssel had denounced the proceedings of Jacobel at Constance; and this denun-

[e] See Andrew Ratisbon Chronic. Eccard, i. p. 2146; and Pez, Thes. Anecdot. Novissim. ii. 3, 626.

ciation could not but exasperate the general animosity against Huss.

On the last day of May the Bohemians presented a memorial to the Council. They expostulated on the neglect of their former petition: they recited the declaration of faith, which had been disseminated throughout Bohemia by the friends of Huss, asserting his full belief in all the articles of the Creed, his determination to defend them to death, and the testimonial of the Grand Inquisitor, the Bishop of Nazareth, acquitting him of all heterodox opinions. They demanded his release from his noisome prison, by which his health was affected, and that he should be heard before the Council against his calumnious enemies. The Patriarch of Antioch answered coldly in the name of the Council, that the testimonials were of no avail, till they should have undergone close examination before themselves; they had no faith in his statements. Yet they would condescend, as an act of grace, to grant him a public hearing; for this end he would be removed from his present confinement. Sigismund so expressed his approbation of that resolution to grant a hearing, that the partisans of Huss weakly concluded that the royal favour would protect their teacher. Bohemian memorial.

The Council would willingly have avoided the notoriety of a public examination. Huss was visited in his cell at Gotleben by the Patriarch of Antioch, by Michael de Causis, and Stephen Palecz. He was urged to retract. They now, however, interrogated him, as he complains, with the captious and ensnaring severity of Inquisitors, adducing against him words culled out of all his letters and discourses; Palecz adduced phrases uttered in frank and careless conversation.[f] The Patriarch reproached him with the wealth he had obtained: "Have you not seventy thousand florins?" His answers were brief and cautious: "I will retract when convinced of my error." June 1.

He was removed to the Franciscan cloister. In the meantime, the utmost industry had been employed in collecting obnoxious passages from all his writings, and from

[f] Compare L'Enfant, i. p. 306, with references to the letters of Huss.

adverse witnesses. The Cardinals sat in Council on these in order to frame articles of accusation. Sigismund required that these articles should be communicated to Huss. The Cardinals deigned to accede, not as of right, but as of favour. The partisans of Huss were prepared, on the other hand, with authenticated copies of all his writings to confront false citations, or contest unjust inferences.

Huss before the Council.

On the 5th of June John Huss was brought in chains into the Council. His works were presented to him; he acknowledged them for his own. The articles were read; but either the indignation of his adversaries, or the zeal of his partisans, or both, raised such an uproar, that silence could hardly be enforced. Huss calmly declared himself ready to maintain his opinions by Scripture and the Fathers. Another outburst of abuse and mockery compelled the Council to adjourn its proceedings.

Second appearance.

On the morning of the 7th of June, Constance was darkened by an eclipse of the sun. At Prague the eclipse was total, a sinister omen to the followers of Huss. Two hours after the darkness had passed away, John Huss stood again before the Council. All the more distinguished Fathers sat in their order. The Emperor was on his throne; a strong guard attended to keep order. Wenzel de Duba and John de Chlum, Nobles, and other Bohemians watched the course of things with grave solicitude. The accusers began on the perilous article of Transubstantiation. But the answer of Huss was clear, distinct, unimpeachable. The Cardinal of Cambray alone, as jealous for his nominalist philosophy as for his orthodox religion, endeavoured by a syllogism about universals, intelligible only according to the scholastic jargon,[g] to prove that Huss must assert that the material bread remained after consecration. Huss extricated himself with address and triumph. "His philosophic doctrine was that of S. Anselm." He averred Transubstantiation to be a perpetual miracle, and so exempt from all logical form. An English Bishop took up the Cardinal's cause. "A boy in the schools," said Huss,

[g] "Credisne universale a parte rei?"

"might answer such puerility." To the other more general charges, that he had preached Wycliffite doctrines; that he officiated as priest when under excommunication by the Pope; that he had spoken with contempt of some of the most learned Prelates of the day, even the Chancellor Gerson; that he had excited tumults in Bohemia; he replied with admirable presence of mind and perfect self-command. Once, indeed, he admitted that he had said, "Wycliffe, I trust, will be saved; but could I think he would be damned, I would my soul were with his." A burst of contemptuous laughter followed this avowal, of which, however, it is not difficult to see the hidden meaning. After some hours of turbulent discussion, he was ordered to withdraw, under custody of the Archbishop of Riga, Keeper of the Seals to the Council.

Before he was removed, the Cardinal of Cambray rose and demanded, whether he had not boasted that, if he had not come to the Council of his own free-will, neither King nor Emperor could have compelled his appearance. "There are many nobles in Bohemia," answered Huss, "who honour me with their protection. Had I not willed to come to the Council, they would have placed me in some stronghold beyond the power of King or Emperor." The Cardinal lifted up his hands in amazement at this insolence; a fierce murmur ran through the assembly. Thereat arose John de Chlum: "John Huss speaks truth; I am one of the least of the nobles of Bohemia; in my castle I would have defended him for a year against all the forces of Emperor or King. How much more Lords mightier than I, with castles far more impregnable!" The Cardinal said in a lower tone, "Huss, I admonish you for your safety and your honour to submit to the Council, as you have promised in prison." All eyes were turned upon the Emperor. Sigismund rose; the purport of his speech was that he had granted the safe-conduct in order to give Huss an opportunity of rendering account of his faith before the Council. The Cardinals and Prelates (he thanked them for it) had granted him this favour; though many asserted that it was beyond his power to

take a heretic under his protection. He counselled Huss to maintain nothing with obstinacy, but to submit to the Council on all articles charged and proved against him. So doing he might return in the good graces of the Council to his home, after some slight penance and moderate satisfaction. "If not, the Council will know how to deal with you. For myself, far from defending you in your errors, and in your contumacy, I will be the first to light the fire with my own hands." Huss began to thank the Emperor for his clemency in granting him safe-conduct. The friendly interruption of John de Chlum reminded him that the Emperor had charged him with obstinacy. He protested in God's name that he had no such intention. "He had come of his own free will to Constance, determined, if better instructed, to surrender his opinions." He was conducted back to prison.

June 8. Third appearance.

The next day Huss stood the third time before the Council. Thirty-nine articles were exhibited against him, twenty-six from his book on the Church, seven from a controversial Tract against Stephen Palecz, six from one against Stanislaus of Znaym. Huss, like most Reformers, held the high Augustinian notion of Predestination. "None were members of the true indefeasible Church, but those predestined to eternal life." On these points he appealed triumphantly to the all-honoured name of Augustine. None dared to answer. But when this theory was applied to Churchmen, to Prelates, to the Pope himself; and when their whole authority was set on their succession not to the titles, but to the virtues of the Apostles, the Council sat amazed and embarrassed. "The Pontiff, who lives not the life of Peter, is no Vicar of Christ, but the forerunner of Antichrist." A citation from S. Bernard seemed to confirm that dread sentence. "The slave of avarice is the successor not of Peter, but of Judas Iscariot." The Churchmen looked at each other and smiled, no doubt some a bitter smile. In an evil moment Huss pressed his fearless logic. "A King in mortal sin is no King before God." Sigismund was looking out of a window: "There never," he was saying, "lived a more pernicious heretic." The Cardinal

of Cambray roused his attention to this last perilous conclusion. Huss repeated his words aloud. The Emperor only answered, "There is no man that sinneth not." "What!" burst out the Cardinal, "art thou not content with degrading the ecclesiastical power, wouldst thou thrust Kings from their thrones?" "A man," argued Palecz, "may be a true Pope, Prelate, or King, though not a true Christian." "Why, then, have you deposed John XXIII.?" The Emperor answered, "For his notorious misdeeds." Huss had been guilty of the rashness of discomfiting and perplexing his adversaries. The Cardinals were most indignant at what Cambray denounced as an unjust and overdrawn appeal to popular animosity against them. They constantly urged that the articles gave but a mild and mitigated notion of the language of Huss. Huss was arraigned for this assertion: "No heretic should suffer more than ecclesiastical punishment, none be delivered to the secular arm to be punished by death." Yet even Huss, and Huss at that moment, shrank from the full avowal of that simple Evangelic maxim. "The heretic was first to be instructed fairly, mildly, humbly, out of the Scriptures and by reason; if he refused to desist from his errors, to be punished according to St. Augustine, in the body."[h] He acknowledged a sentence in his works, which likened those who gave up a heretic to the secular arm unconvicted, to the Pharisees. "Whom," cried the Cardinals, "meanest thou by the Pharisees?" "Those who deliver an innocent man to the civil sword."[i]

At the close of the Session the Cardinal of Cambray urged Huss, who had heard the atrocious charges adduced against him, to make unqualified submission to the Council, and to abjure all his errors: "if he persisted, the Council would know how to proceed." The Emperor condescended to argue with him in the same tone. His two accusers, Palecz and De Causis, appealed to heaven, that they were actuated by no personal hostility towards Huss.

[h] "Corporaliter puniri debere."
[i] Von der Hardt, p. 319. The fullest report of the whole trial.

Huss replied with firm humility, that he sought instruction; he could not abjure errors of which he was not convinced. Many things charged against him were forged, many perverted from their true meaning; he could not abjure those, he could not sin against his conscience. He was remanded to prison; the faithful Bohemian Knight, John de Chlum, followed to console his weary friend.

Speech of the Emperor.

The Emperor rose: "You have heard the charges against Huss proved by trustworthy witnesses, some confessed by himself. In my judgement, each of these crimes is deserving of death. If he does not forswear all his errors, he must be burned. If he submits, he must be stripped of his preacher's office, and banished from Bohemia: there he would only disseminate more dangerous errors. . . . The evil must be extirpated root and branch. . . . If any of his partisans are in Constance, they must be proceeded against with the utmost severity, especially his disciple, Jerome of Prague." Sigismund had wrought himself, no doubt as an excuse to his remonstrant conscience, to a fanaticism of obedience to the Church.

Huss heard in his prison the Emperor's declaration. "I was warned not to trust to his safe-conduct. I have been under a sad delusion; he has condemned me even before mine enemies."

The fatal hour had now come. The Council which asserted itself to be under the actual inspiration of the Holy Ghost, could not recede without the impeachment of indifference to doctrines which itself had declared to be deadly heresy, or without disavowing the right established by the terrible usage of centuries, of awarding capital punishment for that which the Church had been so long teaching the world was a mortal crime; a crime which it was the most sacred duty to God and man in the Priest to avenge, in the temporal Sovereign, at the demand of the Priest, to punish by fire. Huss could not retract without perjury to his own conscience; without base treachery to his followers, whom he had instructed, whom he had kindled to a fanatic faith in that which himself had believed, which he still believed, to be the saving Gospel

of Christ, and this from the fear of death, death which, as he himself was assured, as his partisans had no less confidence, would secure him the martyr's crown.

A form of recantation was drawn by Cardinal Zabarella, studiously mild in its terms, but of necessity an explicit renunciation of his errors, a humble submission to the determinations, to the definitions of the Holy Council. He was to abjure, retract, revoke all his errors, and undergo whatever penance the Council might decree for his soul's health.

The answer of Huss was first a prayer to God Almighty for everlasting life, through Christ Jesus. He thanked the reverend Father, Zabarella of Florence, for his pious and paternal kindness. "But if Eleazar under the Old Law refused to eat forbidden food, lest he should sin against God, and leave a bad example to posterity, how can I, a Priest of the New Law, however unworthy, from fear of a punishment so brief and transitory, sin so heinously against the law of God, first by departure from truth, secondly by perjury, thirdly by grievous scandal to my brethren? It is better for me to die, than by avoiding momentary punishment to fall into the hands of God, and perhaps into everlasting fire. I have appealed to Jesus Christ, the One All-powerful and All-just Judge; to Him I commit my cause, who will judge every man, not according to false witnesses and erring Councils, but according to truth and man's desert."[k] Answer of Huss.

Persons of the highest rank, Cardinals, Prelates, the Emperor, even his adversary, Stephen Palecz, again entreated him, and with tears, to depart from his stubborn resolution. His answer was calm, unboastful, with nothing of the vehemence or contemptuousness of fanaticism; he acknowledged how hardly his soul was tried; at the same time, in his letters to Bohemia, some of which were publicly read in the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, and in others addressed to the University of Prague, he declared that he could forswear no one of his doctrines. He had not been convinced out of Attempt to persuade him to yield.

[k] Von der Hardt, iv. 329.

the Scriptures, he awaited in tranquillity the judgement of the Lord.

The Council proceeded in full Session to condemn the doctrine of Jacob de Mies concerning the Cup: an omen and a warning. The writings of Huss were ordered to be publicly burned. The Council itself sent another deputation to urge submission. The Emperor had been a short time absent; the day before the final judgement, he sent four Bishops, Wenzel of Duba, and John de Chlum, with a still mitigated form of recantation. He was only to retract those tenets which he acknowledged to be his own. Even John de Chlum endeavoured to move, or rather to strengthen him. "I am but an unlettered man, unfit to counsel one so learned. If you are conscious of error, be not ashamed to confess it to the Council. If not, I cannot advise you to act against your conscience. Bear any punishment rather than renounce the truth." Huss answered, that he would abandon any opinion on proofs adduced from the Holy Scriptures. A Bishop reproached him with arrogantly setting up his opinion against the whole Council. "Let the lowest in the Council convince me, I will humbly own my error." The night before his condemnation Huss made confession, and, it is asserted, received absolution from a monk. [1415] July 1.

The Council met in the Cathedral; the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia presided. Sigismund and the Princes of the Empire were present. While Mass was celebrated, Huss, as a heretic, stood in the porch. The Bishop of Lodi preached from the text, "That the body of sin might be destroyed."[m] It was a fierce declamation: it suggested that Huss was as "bad as Arius, worse than Sabellius." The preacher closed with adulatory praise of the Emperor. "It is thy glorious office to destroy heresies and schism, especially this obstinate heretic." He pointed to Huss, who was kneeling in an elevated place and in fervent prayer.

A Decree of the Council was read, inhibiting all present, without exception, Prelates, Princes, Kings, Em-

[m] Rom. vi. 6. The sermon may be read in Von der Hardt, iii. 1.

perors, under pain of excommunication and two months' imprisonment, to speak without permission, to reply, to interrupt the proceedings, to give any sign or murmur of applause or disapprobation either with the hands or feet. Certain tenets of Wycliffe were here recited and condemned; afterwards thirty articles containing the doctrines of Huss.[n] Often, while these articles were read, Huss attempted to speak; as often he was put to silence. At length, while he was arraigned as believing that the material bread remained after the consecration, he broke out, "That I deny, so I have never believed or taught." He renounced with equal vehemence a charge that he had added a fourth person to the Trinity; he defied them to produce their nameless witness. His appeal to Christ was treated as an impious error, "Oh blessed Jesus!" he uttered with a loud voice, "This thy Council condemns us, because in our afflictions we have sought refuge with Thee, the One just Judge." He added, "This I constantly affirm, that the surest and most safe appeal is to the Lord Jesus; Him none can pervert or bribe by gifts, none deceive by false witnesses, or beguile by craft. He will render unto every one his own." He justified himself for having continued to officiate as Priest after his excommunication by the Pope. "Freely came I hither under the safe-conduct of the Emperor." He turned and looked steadily at Sigismund. A deep blush passed over the face of the Emperor.

The Bishop of Concordia, an aged, bald Italian Prelate, rose to read the two sentences, one condemning the writings, the other the person of John Huss to the flames; his writings, as propagating the tenets of the heresiarch Wycliffe, and as containing many things erroneous, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, some notoriously heretical; all, both in Latin and Bohemian, were adjudged to be publicly and solemnly burned.

Huss was commanded to kneel to hear his own sentence. The Council, having God before its eyes, declared Huss a real and manifest heresiarch, who had advanced doctrines offensive, rash, seditious, Sentence.

[n] Von der Hardt; more briefly in L'Enfant, p. 403.

had trampled under foot the Power of the Keys and the censures of the Church, had scandalised all true Christians, by his appeal to Jesus Christ. "This John Huss, being thus obstinate and incorrigible, who has refused to enter into the bosom of the Church, and abjure his errors." Huss broke in, "I have ever desired, and still desire, to be instructed out of the Holy Scriptures." The Bishop concluded with condemning him to be degraded and despoiled of his Orders. Huss rose from his knees; he uttered a fervent prayer to God to pardon his enemies. Some of the older Priests, even Bishops, looked sternly at him, and laughed his prayers to scorn. The Archbishop of Milan, the Bishops of Bangor, Feltre, Ast (in Hungary), Alexandria, and Lavaur were designated for the office of degradation. Huss was clad in all the attire of the Priesthood, and led with the cup in his hand to the high altar, as if about to celebrate Mass. As they put on the alb, he said, "They put a white robe on our Lord to mock him, when Herod sent him to Pilate." Once more the Bishops implored him to recant. He declined for the same reasons alleged before. "Behold," said the Bishops, "how obstinate he is in his malice." The cup was taken from his hand: "Accursed Judas, thou hast deserted the way of peace, thou hast entered into counsel with the Jews. We take away this cup in which the blood of Christ is offered for the redemption of souls." Huss said, "I trust that I shall drink it this day in the kingdom of heaven." He was stripped one by one of his robes, on each a curse was pronounced. "These mockeries I bear with equal mind for the name and the truth of Christ." The tonsure was now to be effaced. They disputed whether it was to be done with scissors or with a razor. "Lo! they cannot agree," said Huss, "how to put me to shame." It was done with scissors; the hair cut in the form of a cross; a high paper crown, daubed over with devils, was set on his head. "We devote thy soul to the devils in hell." "And I commend my soul to the most merciful Lord, Christ Jesus." So the Church made over the heresiarch to the secular arm. The Emperor delivered him to Louis, Elector Palatine, the Imperial Vicar; the

Degradation.

Elector to the Magistrates of Constance, the Magistrates to the executioners.

Huss was led away with two of the headsman's servants before him, two behind. Eight hundred horse followed, and the whole multitude from the city. Execution. Over a narrow bridge they went in single file, lest it should break with their weight. They stopped before the Bishop's palace, that Huss might gaze on the pile on which his books lay burning. He only smiled at this ineffectual act of vengeance. As he went along he addressed the people in German, protesting against the injustice of his sentence, "His adversaries had been able to convince him of no error." The place of execution was a meadow without the walls. He knelt, recited several psalms, with the perpetual burthen, "Lord Jesus, have mercy upon me. Into thy hands I commend my spirit." "We know not," said the people, "what this man may have done, we only know that his prayers to God are excellent." They asked if he would have a confessor. A Priest on a stately horse, and richly attired, protested that no confessor should be granted to a heretic. But Reichenthal, as himself relates, called forth Ulric Schorand, a man of piety and wisdom. But Ulric required that Huss should first retract the errors for which he was condemned. Huss declined to confess on such terms. "I have no need, I am guilty of no mortal sin." He endeavoured to address the people again in German. The Elector Palatine refused permission. Then Huss prayed aloud, "Lord Jesus, for thy sake I endure with patience this cruel death. I beseech thee to pardon mine enemies." As he spoke, the paper mitre fell from his head. The rude soldiers replaced it: "He shall be burned with all his devils." He spoke gently to his guards. "I trust that I shall reign with Christ, since I die for his Gospel."

He was then tied fast by an old rusty chain to the stake affixed on a platform. The Elector Palatine and the Marshal Oppenheim advanced, and again urged him to recant. Huss replied, that he willingly signed his testimony with his blood. All he had taught and written was

to save men's souls from Satan, and from the dominion of sin. The fire blazed up; it is said that an old woman was busy in heaping the wood. "Oh, holy simplicity!" said Huss. With the last feeble sounds of his voice he was heard to chant verses of the Psalms, and to pray to the Redeemer. All the remains of the body were torn in pieces, even his clothes thrown into the fire; the ashes were gathered and thrown into the lake, lest his disciples should make reliques of them. But their faithful piety scraped together the earth around the pile, and carried it to Bohemia.[o]

So perished John Huss as an obstinate incorrigible heretic, but his heresy has never been clearly defined. It was not a denial of any of the great doctrinal truths of universal Christianity, nor any of those tenets of belief rejected afterwards by the German and English Reformers. On Transubstantiation (notwithstanding the subtleties of his adversaries), the Communion in one kind, worship of the Saints and of the Virgin Mary, Huss was scrupulously, unimpeachably orthodox. He was the martyr to the power of the hierarchy, not the power of the Pope, which the Council itself had renounced in its extreme theory; his testimony was against that supreme ecclesiastical dominion, which had so long ruled the mind of man.

Proceedings in Bohemia.

Bohemia, at the news of the burning of Huss, seemed to rise with one impulse of sorrow and indignation. National and religious zeal animated all ranks, all orders. The King openly denounced the treachery of Sigismund and the barbarous injustice of the Council. The Bishop of Lieutomyssel had been commanded by the Council to communicate their act, and to exhort the Bohemians to extirpate the heresies which were teeming in the kingdom. The Magnates of Bohemia met in the Chapel of Bethlehem, whose walls might still seem to sound with the eloquent preachings of Huss. An address to the Council was framed and signed by

Sept. 2.

[o] The whole description of the last hours of Huss is from Reichenthal and the two nameless biographers of Huss, who all were eye-witnesses. Compare L'Enfant, and Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund.

sixty of the greatest names, nobles, barons, knights, gentlemen, denouncing the execution of Huss, as inflicting perpetual infamy and disgrace on the kingdom of Bohemia and the Marquisate of Moravia. They protested that Huss was a good Catholic Christian, of the holiest conversation and most Evangelic doctrine; a man who detested and never taught error or heresy, whose life was devoted to the edification of the people. They complained of the imprisonment, perhaps the death of the eloquent Jerome of Prague, that "illustrious philosopher," like Huss convicted of no crime, but accused, like Huss, by wicked and treacherous informers, the enemies of Bohemia. They declared that whoever averred heresies to prevail in the kingdom of Bohemia lied in his throat; they concluded with leaving the redress of their injuries to God, who will punish the proud, being determined when the Church should be united under one supreme and undisputed pastor, to prosecute to the utmost this violation of the rights and dignity, this execution of the innocent subjects, of their realm. Strong measures were taken in a subsequent meeting to protect the Hussite priests against their Bishops. The popular fury had broken out in acts of persecution against the old clergy, and against the monks. The Emperor addressed the Bohemians in a letter, half-rebuke for their turbulent proceedings, half-apology for his own unroyal weakness in surrendering Huss to his enemies. "It was with inexpressible grief, after having more than once threatened to leave Constance, only to avert the dissolution of the Council, that he had submitted to the decree of Christendom, represented by the whole hierarchy, and by the ambassadors of all Christian Sovereigns."[p] Sept. 5.

But neither did the sacrifice of one victim satiate, nor the dread of the revolt of a whole kingdom arrest the severe determination of the Council to suppress by these terrible means the growing resistance to ecclesiastical rule. They would break the yoke under which themselves

[p] "Neque etiam licuit nobis ulterius pro hoc negotio loqui, quia exinde concilium totaliter fuisset dissolutum." This most remarkable letter in the Appendix to L'Enfant.

groaned, that of the Pope; but the more resolute were they that their own yoke should not be broken. Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, stood almost alone in assertion of the great maxim, "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live." He almost alone condemned the punishment of death for heresy.[q] The Emperor had left Constance; had he remained, Jerome of Prague could show no safe-conduct on his part. Jerome of Prague, to the short relief of the more moderate, displayed not the stubborn courage of John Huss. Four months of weary imprisonment, in chains, in darkness, on meagre diet; the terror, as himself owned, of the stake; sickness; the bland promises of some, the awful threats of others; the persuasions of weaker friends, broke his spirit. In a public Session of the Council, Jerome of Prague appeared and made a full retractation of all errors against the Catholic faith, especially those of Wycliffe and John Huss.

Jerome of Prague.

Recants. Sept. 23.

Instead of opening the prison doors and sending forth the strong man shorn of his strength; if insincere or repentant of his weakness with the burthen of apostasy on his conscience; under the suspicion, if not the contempt of his partisans, who could not but contrast his pusillanimity with the unbroken resolution of Huss; instead of placing him, as they might, in safe custody, the Council, with vengeance not less impolitic than unchristian, loaded itself with the crime of another inhuman execution, and compelled Jerome of Prague to a martyrdom hardly less noble than that of Huss. It was asserted by his implacable enemies, Michael de Causis and Stephen Palecz, that the recantation was ambiguous.

New articles were exhibited against him. The Cardinals of Cambray, Aquileia, Orsini, and Florence (Zabarella had drawn the form of retractation) withdrew in indignation from the commission of inquiry. But different Commissioners were named at the instigation of his two implacable adversaries. The Patriarch of Antioch and (it is sad to write) the Chancellor Gerson

April 27.

[q] Aschbach, p. 202, with authorities.

urged this virtual breach of faith. Fresh charges were accumulated. Thrice was Jerome again arraigned before a General Congregation. The last time he was permitted to pour forth a long declamation in his defence, he dwelt on all the great men who had been the victims of false accusation, Socrates, Seneca, Boethius, Plato, the Prophets, the Protomartyr Stephen. He ascribed his persecution to the hereditary unforgiving hatred between the Germans and Bohemians. He acknowledged some concern in the tumults in the University of Prague, when certain Germans had lost their lives. He confessed his flight from Constance, and still further, "I confess that, moved by cowardly fear of the stake, against my conscience, I have consented to the condemnation of the doctrines of Wycliffe and John Huss. This sinful retractation I now fully retract, and am resolved to maintain the tenets of Wycliffe and of John Huss to death, believing them to be the true and pure doctrine of the Gospel, even as their lives were blameless and holy."

May 23.

May 26.

Recants his recantation.

From that moment Jerome of Prague resumed all his calm intrepidity. He was speedily condemned as a relapsed heretic. The Bishop of Lodi, doubtless as supposed to be gifted with most impressive eloquence, was again called upon to preach the funeral sermon of the heretic. His text was, "He reproached their unbelief and hardness of heart." On his own charity and that of the Council, their charity to the heretic himself, and to the rest of Christendom, for whose sake heresy was to be extirpated, the preacher was unctuous and self-adulatory. He laid down as irrefragably just the ordinary, the rightful course of procedure against all commonly reputed heretics. There should be diligent inquisition for them; they should be apprehended, placed in strong prisons. Articles should be exhibited against them, witnesses admitted, even the most infamous, usurers, ribalds, common prostitutes. The heretics should be sworn to speak the truth. If they refuse to speak, they are to be put upon the rack, and subjected to various tortures. None should be admitted to visit them, but under

May 30, 1416. Condemnation.

strong necessity; they ought not to be heard in public. If they shall recant, they are to find mercy. If obstinate, they are to be condemned and made over to the secular arm. This brief and frightful and authoritative statement of the dominant usage is contrasted by the preacher with the magnanimous mercy of the Council to Jerome of Prague.[r]

Jerome was permitted to answer; he answered with boldness bordering on scorn. He ended thus: "You are resolved to condemn me in this wicked and iniquitous manner, without having convicted me of any crime; but after my death I will be in your consciences an ever-gnawing worm. I appeal to the Supreme Judge, before whom ye will appear with me, ere a hundred years are passed."[s]

An accomplished Florentine, Poggio Bracciolini, present at the trial, has left an account of the demeanour of Jerome, which impressed him as a display of power and eloquence, almost unrivalled at any time. Emerging from a fœtid dungeon, after the depression of a long confinement, with the weight of his recantation upon him, against an adverse Court, he stood his ground with wonderful copiousness, fluency, and readiness of language, and with consummate dexterity, now deeply pathetic, now with playful wit or taunting sarcasm, confounding, bewildering, overpowering his adversaries. His voice was sweet, clear, sonorous, with a certain dignity; his gesture admirably fitted to express indignation, or to move that commiseration, which he neither sought nor cared to obtain. He stood fearless, intrepid, like another Cato, not only despising, courting death.[t]

His death was as surprising for its calmness and courage.

Execution.

Two days were left to permit him to retract again. The Cardinal of Florence attempted to persuade him to submission. His countenance was con-

[r] The whole sermon is remarkable. It is in Von der Hardt, iii. p. 35. There was a lofty burst of feudal indignation, that two men, vile plebeians of the basest sort, of unknown birth, should have convulsed the whole kingdom of Bohemia.

[s] L'Enfant is inclined, I think on insufficient grounds, to doubt the authenticity of these last words.

[t] Poggio Bracciolini Oper.

stantly not only composed but cheerful.[u] He was bound naked to the stake; he continued to sing hymns with his deep untrembling voice. The executioner offered to light the fire behind him, lest he should see it. "Light it before my face," said the martyr: "had I the least fear, I should not be standing in this place."

There remained one case of criminal jurisprudence for the decision of this great Senate of Christendom.

Before the Council of Constance, were arraigned for different violations of the law of God and man, three persons, all, somewhat singularly, bearing the name of John. Pope John XXIII., according to the articles exhibited against him, and those articles supported by undoubted testimony, and so affirmed by the Council, and put forth as the accredited foundation of their judgement, had been guilty from his youth, and during his whole life, of the foulest crimes, being a priest, of licentiousness which passes belief, promiscuous concubinage, incest, the violation of nuns; of the most atrocious cruelties, murder, massacre, the most grinding tyranny, unglutted avarice, unblushing simony. He had rarely celebrated the solemn rites of the Church, the Holy Sacraments, and then with contemptuous neglect and indifference.[x] Against some of these charges John made no defence; in some he seemed to acquiesce, only resting on the plea that they were no heresies, and that the Pope could be judged for heresy alone. John XXIII. was deposed from his Pontifical office, having fled from the Council in violation of his own most solemn protestations; he was ignominiously apprehended, and cast into prison; he was detained in dishonourable but not harsh captivity till the close of the Council. Afterwards, having ceased to be dangerous to the ruling Pope, and having humbled himself before his feet, he was permitted to close his days in peace, even in honour, for he was raised again to the rank of a Cardinal.

[u] Von der Hardt, iii. 64.

[x] "Unus Articulus qui fuit in ordine sextus plura vitia conclusit sub hâc formâ. Item quod dictus Johannes fuit et est pauperum oppressor; justitiæ persecutor; iniquitatum columna; Simoniacorum statua; carnis cultor; vitiorum fex; a virtutibus peregrinus; infamiæ speculum et omnium malitiarum profundus admonitor; adeo et in tantum scandalizans ecclesiam Christi, quod inter Christi fideles vitam et mores cognoscentes vulgariter dicitur Diabolus Incarnatus."—Thus speaks a Council of a Pope! Gobelinus, p. 341.

The second, John Huss, of life blameless to austerity, absolutely unimpeachable in his morals, charged only with some indirect connection with turbulent proceedings in Bohemia, with an acquittal of all heresy from the Archbishop of Prague and the Grand Inquisitor, with a safe-conduct from the Emperor, was accused of erroneous belief in Transubstantiation and the Administration of the Cup to the Laity. These charges he distinctly denied, and repelled to the satisfaction of most present: he was likewise accused of having denounced the corruptions and vices of the clergy: yet his denunciations, not to speak of those of Nicolas of Clemangis, Henry of Hessia, Theodoric à Niem, Theodore de Vrie, could hardly have surpassed in severity those of men who sat in judgement upon him, Gerson and Peter d'Ailly Cardinal of Cambray. It is difficult to define or to apprehend the precise remaining delinquencies or errors of which he was found guilty, as having adopted and propagated the condemned doctrines of Wycliffe, treated with derision, or undermined the Power of the Keys, and the absolute indefeasible authority of the clergy, and making that authority dependent not on their succession or ordination, but on their personal holiness. For these offences, notwithstanding the Imperial safe-conduct, John Huss was seized, imprisoned, burned at the stake.

The third, Jean Petit, in an acknowledged, and published, and unambiguous writing, had vindicated as just and lawful a most foul and treacherous murder. In this vindication he had laid down principles utterly subversive of human society, principles which would let loose mankind upon each other, like wild beasts; principles in direct violation of one of the Commandments of God, and in plain, bold opposition to every precept and to the whole religion of Christ.[y]

Jean Petit had escaped by death all personal penalty.[z] The condemnation of his book by the Council of Constance, through the awe and influence of the Duke of Burgundy, was postponed, debated, at length eluded. For

[y] See in Monstrelet the Eight Principles of Jean Petit, ii. c. xxxix.

[z] He died 1411; it is said repenting of his book.

to condemn Jean Petit for his abstract propositions, was to condemn the act of the Duke of Burgundy. From the first the partisans of Burgundy, with the acquiescence, the servile admission of those who dared not be his enemies, acquitted the Duke of all personal participation in a crime of which all believed, all knew him to be guilty. But the Council of Constance, to its close, hesitated to pass that censure demanded and uttered by the shuddering abhorrence of mankind against the book of Jean Petit. A Council of Faith at Paris, under the Archbishop and the Grand Inquisitor, had condemned the Eight Verities asserted by Jean Petit. The Council of Constance would not affirm this censure; it was even annulled on account of informality by the Cardinal Orsini and others of the same rank. The world eagerly awaited the decree of the supreme authority in Christendom on the momentous question, the legality of murder. Session after session dragged out in illimitable length. Bishops, Abbots, theologians, the Bishop of Arras, the Abbots of Clairvaux and Citeaux, Jean de la Roche, a learned Dominican, did not scruple to undertake the contest, to allege every kind of captious objection, every subtlety of scholastic logic. These monstrous tenets were declared to be only moral and philosophical opinions, not of faith, therefore out of the province of the Church and of the Council. Gerson, the prosecutor in the name of the University of Paris, not avowedly, though known to be in secret supported by the King of France, could not but perceive the monstrous incongruity between the condemnation of John Huss for his anti-hierarchical tenets as of Faith, and the dismissal of questions which concerned the first elements of religion and the Commandments, as beyond the province of Faith. Gerson himself was involved in charges of heresy by the advocates of Jean Petit, determined at all hazards to silence their powerful antagonist. With difficulty a condemnation was extorted of one broad and general proposition. "It is lawful and even meritorious in any vassal or subject to kill a tyrant, either by stratagem, by blandishment, flattery, or force, notwithstanding any oath or covenant sworn with him, without awaiting the sentence or authority of

any judge."[a] Yet even this censure was annulled, as wanting in form, by the new Pope. Nothing could induce Martin V. to condemn in full Council either the propositions of Jean Petit, or kindred doctrines which had been published in Poland.[b] Even the memory of the third John escaped unscathed from any authoritative proscription by Council or by Pope. But Gerson, the learned, pious Gerson, dared not return to Paris, now in the power of Burgundy and the English; he lay hid for a time in Germany, lingered out a year or two at Lyons, and died a proscribed and neglected exile; finding his only consolation, no doubt full consolation, in the raptures of his Holy Mysticism.[c]

[a] Von der Hardt, iv. 442; L'Enfant, p. 408.

[b] L'Enfant, ii. 212; Gerson. Opera, v. 1014.

[c] "Synodo finitâ Joannes Gersonius, tot laborum suorum, insignisque pietatis, ac in justitiam ac verum ardentissimi amoris, non aliud præmium consecutus est, quam perpetuum exilium."—Dupin, Vit. Gerson. p. xxxvi.

CHAPTER X.

CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. POPE MARTIN V.

YET by these acts (the affair of Jean Petit dragged on its close) the Council of Constance had only commenced its proper work, the Reformation of the Church and the election of a Pope. Nor had the Fathers approached the solution of the great difficulty, which of these was to take precedence. This question involved another perhaps of higher moment. Could the Church legally reform itself without a Pope? Was it complete, invested in full power of action without a head? Nor, though John XXIII. was removed, was the ground clear for the election of a new Pope. There were still two Popes, who had not absolutely abandoned their claims; and whose ambassadors had been admitted by the Council. Gregory XII., friendless, worn out, made no resistance; indeed, before the election of the new Pope he had relieved the Council by his death. But the Spaniard, Benedict XIII., was impracticable. Month after month for above a year he fought with firmness, which might have been admired in a better cause. The Emperor met at Perpignan the Kings of Arragon, Castile, and Navarre. Benedict refused a safe-conduct addressed to him only as a Cardinal; he would appear only as Pope in his Pontifical robes. He appeared, fled, appeared again. His demands were as exorbitant as if he still divided the world. He would have the Council of Pisa annulled, the Council of Constance broken up, a new and more impartial tribunal summoned. He would cede, and he would not cede; he would dictate, not receive laws of reform. Again he fled to Collaria, a strong fortress near the sea. He was besieged by the deputies of the Spanish cities. He withdrew to the more impregnable Peniscola.

Two great questions.

Benedict XIII.

Aug. 31.

Nov. 2.

At Narbonne certain capitulations were framed; according to which the Kings of Arragon, Castile, Navarre, and the Count de Foix renounced their obedience to Benedict. The Spaniards joined the Council, they formed a fifth Nation. Benedict, deserted by his Cardinals, cited again and again, declared contumacious, accused, condemned, deposed, to the last adhered to himself. Two Benedictine monks brought him the summons of the Council. "Are ye the ravens returned to the Ark? No wonder that the ravens gather where the dead body is!" He received the sentence with the utmost impatience, threw back on the Council the charge of schism, and broke out, striking his chair with violence, "Not at Constance, the Church is at Peniscola." He created two new Cardinals, maintained the forms of state, and not till some years after died at Peniscola as obstinate and unyielding as he had lived.

Dec. 13.
Jan. 1417.
March 8.
April 1.

The deposition of Benedict brought the two contending parties into direct conflict. On the all-important but undecided question, the Cardinals, on one side, insisted that no reform could be valid, authoritative, complete, unless by the Church in her full and perfect capacity, with a Pope at her head. The Emperor, supported by the Germans and English, was determined not to let slip the golden opportunity for reform, unembarrassed if not by the natural repugnance, by all the forms and difficulties inseparable from the Papal assent. They maintained the imperious necessity of reform in the head as well as in the members. The Pope himself must submit to the salutary restrictions imposed on the rest of the hierarchy; and could that be expected, could it be extorted from an actual ruling Pope? Menacing and ominous signs of division began to appear. The Cardinals protested against proceeding to any reform unauthorised by a Pope; the Germans and the English were accused of heresy, for promulgating such dangerous doctrines. The Emperor took the strong measure of prohibiting the separate meetings of the Cardinals.

Divisions in the Council.
August. September.
Sept. 16.

At this juncture, the death of Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, changed the whole state of affairs. On his wisdom, on his resolute firmness, the Emperor had relied; his authority held together the Germans and the English. The French, from hatred of the English, had somewhat cooled in their ardent zeal for reform; they had even contested the right of the English to vote, especially after the arrival of the Spaniards, as one of the Nations. In D'Ailly the Cardinal prevailed over the Reformer. Two of the more distinguished German Prelates were bought over. Wallenrod of Riga received the wealthy Bishopric of Liege, with its princedom, Abondi of Coire the Archbishopric of Riga.[a] Only a few days after Hallam's death the English fell off to the Italian party; the Emperor was compelled to assent to the election of a Pope, upon the specious but precarious resolution that the Pope should stipulate to reform the Church before the dissolution of the Council. The angry feud between the Emperor and the Cardinals was allayed by the good offices of Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester (uncle of King Henry VI.), on his return from the Holy Land, and so invested with a kind of holy influence. Sept. 4. Death of Robert Hallam.

Great bodies are apt, when weary of the tardy and encumbered progress of affairs, to rush on in headlong precipitation, and to accomplish in reckless haste what might seem to require the most grave and slow deliberation. They waste years in debate, and then do desperately in a few days or hours the most important acts. The hard-wrung consent of the Emperor was given on the last day of September. The inevitable contests as to the form of election were over in one month. On the 30th of October (at its Fortieth Session) the Council made its last effort for independent life. It declared that it was not to be dissolved till the Pope had granted reform. On the 8th of November those who were to be joined with the Cardinals in the privilege of election (this concession the Council had demanded and obtained) were named. Twenty-three Cardinals and thirty Delegates of the

[a] Von der Hardt, iv. 1432-1440. Probably, after the consent to the election, as a reward.

Council entered the Conclave. The strife was sharp but short. On the 11th of November, an Italian, a Roman, a noble of the house of Colonna, had united the suffrages; the Cardinal Colonna, elected on St. Martin's day, took the name of Martin V.[b]

Election of Martin V.

The election of the Pope woke the whole Council to a paroxysm of joy. He was at once invested in the Papal robes, and placed on the altar, where eager throngs hasted to kiss his feet. The Emperor prostrated himself before the Pontiff, and paid that act of reverential homage. Throughout the rest of the ceremonial of the inauguration Constance vied with Rome in its pomp, and in its adherence to the ancient formularies, as far as could be done in a strange city. The immense multitudes, which might more fairly be supposed to represent Christendom, made up for the sacred emotions inseparable from Rome. If the Minster of Constance but poorly represented the time-hallowed Lateran, the fantastic S. Maria Maggiore, the Apostolic Church of St. Peter, the inexhaustible crowds of all nations, Kings, Princes, Burghers, Prelates, Clergy of all the kingdoms of Europe, might add even greater dignity to the ceremony than the so-called Consuls, Senators, Magistrates, and populace of Rome.

The Cardinal Otto Colonna was a man in elevating whom conflicting parties might meet without the humiliation of a compromise. Of the highest birth, irreproachable morals, with the reputation of learning in the Canon Law, in only two points he had departed from the most calm moderation, in both with the full sympathies of the Council. He had been strenuous for the condemnation of Huss; he had adhered to, had even followed Pope John in his flight; but this would find excuse as an act of generous fidelity to the ruling Pontiff and to a falling friend. In all other respects he had held a middle course with great dignity; no stern adversary of reformation, no

[b] "Quod autem in Papam electus est ille, qui de Collegio Cardinalium obedientiæ Urbani Papæ descendit, Spiritus Sanctus quodam mysterio singulari egisse præsumitur: cum id quod prius ira, odium, insidia et protervitas et ultio dubium facti temporis diuturnitate subortum, de Papatus justa possessione discerni non siverant, hoc jam totius mundi consensus simpliciter in cordibus veritatem et justitiam diligentium scintillaret."—Gobelinus, p. 344.

alarming fanatic for change. He was courteous in manners, short and sententious in speech, quick and dexterous yet cautious in business, a strict and even ostentatious lover of justice. His enemies could only assert that much craft lurked under his moderation; later in life his prudence degenerated into avarice. The conduct of the Pope, until the dissolution of the Council, the dissolution of the Council without any great general measure of reform, while he avoided all serious offence to the Emperor or to the more formidable advocates of reform, display the great sagacity, the consummate policy of Martin V.

Yet in his first act Martin might seem to throw off his moderation, and to declare hastily and imperiously his determination to maintain all the existing abuses. The Papal chancery had been the object of the longest, loudest, and most just clamour. The day after the election, the Pope published a Brief confirming all the regulations established by his predecessors, even by John XXIII.[c] All the old grievances, Reservations, Expectancies, Vacancies, Confirmations of Bishops, Dispensations, Exemptions, Commendams, Annates, Tenths, Indulgences,[d] might seem to be adopted as the irrepealable law of the Church.[e] The form was not less dictatorial than the sub-

First act of Martin V.

[c] On the regulations of the Roman Chancery, see Eichhorn, iii. p. 511, note. To the Chancery belonged the preparation and expedition of all Briefs and Bulls, appeals, negotiations. The Dataria was originally a branch of the Chancery; from the Dataria came all grants, gifts, appointments to benefices. The head of the whole was the Protonotarius or Primicerius, called also Corrector of the Papal Letters. There was a College of Abbreviators, 12 de parco majori, 22 de parco minori (from these were the Rescribendarius, the Taxatores who fixed the price of Briefs or Bulls, and the Plumbator who held the seal), the rest, making up 72, might be laymen or married men, and were called examiners. The first wore the violet dress of bishops. There were three courts of justice, the Rota, the Signatura Justitiæ, and Signatura Gratiæ. All this vast incorporation was maintained by the fees of office.

[d] The decree is in Von der Hardt, i. p. 955 *et seqq.*, L'Enfant, ii. 415-426; countersigned by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Nov. 12, 1417, published, with severe penalties for its infringement, Feb. 26, 1418.

[e] The right of the Holy See to appoint to all benefices, out of which gradually grew up all these abuses of Reservations, Provisions, Dispensations, Annates, Commendams, Pluralities, was unknown till the twelfth century. The prerogative might seem necessarily vested in the universal Bishop, enabling him, by his higher episcopal authority, to place the worthiest men in every office or function of the Universal Church. Its first exercise appears to have been, when on the removal, the deposition, or degradation of any unfit, criminal, or heretical dignitary, the right might devolve* on the supreme arbiter (these were mostly cases of appeal) to substitute some worthier prelate. Hadrian IV. began to recommend spiritual persons

* This was called "Jus devolutionis."

stance of the decree. It was an act of the Pope, not of the Council. It was throughout the Pope who enacted and ordained; it was the absolute resumption of the

to the bishops for preferment. These *prayers* with his successors grew into mandates: the haughty Alexander III. not merely issued those mandates, but sent his officers to enforce their execution.* It was an early usage, too, that when a prelate or high dignitary died at Rome, the Pope and the Roman Court in their abundant charity would send a successor from Rome for the consolation of the widowed Church.†

Innocent III. first asserted for the Supreme Pontiff the plenary power of disposing of all benefices, for the advantage of such persons as should have deserved well of the See of Rome.‡ From this time Bulls for the appointment of such prelates bear the significant words of "our plenary authority:" and the more sweeping "notwithstanding," which at once annulled all existing rights, privileges, prescriptions of rightful patrons. The Papal Legates were invested in the same high powers;§ in them, if they deemed it necessary to put forth their power, was the derivative authority to summon any ecclesiastic to any office or dignity. As yet it was the haughty assertion on special occasions only, and occasions in many cases such as might seem to justify the Papal interference and the exercise of this all-embracing prerogative. We have seen Stephen Langton seated on the throne of Canterbury by this title, in vain contested by the King, admitted by the world. Clement IV. fifty years later specially reserved for the Papal nomination all benefices of which the possessors died at Rome.‖ That which was a proud prerogative, exercised so far with some modesty, and with some respect for the high purposes for which it was assumed, with the Avignonese Pontiffs and their successors became a wanton and arbitrary authority, exercised for the aggrandisement of the Pope's power and the Pope's wealth. Already Clement V. reserved for himself, out of his love for his former see, the archbishopric and certain abbeys in Bourdeaux. John XXII. not only extended the special reservation to whole dioceses, Aquileia, Milan, Ravenna, Genoa, and Pisa, but, as we have seen, proclaimed the Papal reservation of all benefices vacated by promotions through the grace of the Roman See. We have seen, too, that John XXII. endeavoured by one sweeping edict to strip all pluralists of their execrable and unholy accumulation of preferments; and to secure their spoils, as Reserves, for himself and the Holy See. We have seen how out of the Reservations arose the *Expectatives*, granted with such lavish prodigality by the Italian Popes who succeeded to those of Avignon; with the not less lucrative creation of *vacancies*.

With the reservation of benefices, and still more with the right of confirmation of bishops—a right asserted, and more or less rigidly exercised, since the twelfth century—was closely connected the right of the taxation of benefices. The tax assumed the name of Annates, as calculated on the annual revenue of the benefice. It was levied as a fee on consecration upon every bishop confirmed in Rome. At first it was confined to prelacies. Clement V. extended this privilege of paying a year's income to all benefices in England. John XXII. extended it throughout Christendom for three years only, on account of the pressing necessities of the Roman Church;* but those necessities ceased not to be urgent: the three years grew into a perpetuity.† Towards the end of the fourteenth century it became a tax, the fees on confirmation must be paid over and above. Thus the Papal Chancery held a roll of assessment of the value of almost all benefices in Christendom: this ecclesiastical valuation was raised from time to time, as not only the annates, the first-fruits, but the tenths, which were occasionally commanded or granted, were collected according to this cataster.‡ In the same manner the Popes seized, what Kings had claimed, the possessions left by the clergy, and the produce of vacant benefices. The

* See Eichhorn, iii. p. 507, Preces, Mandata.
† "In consolationem de obitu defuncti."—Ibid.
‡ Planck, iv. p. 721.
§ "De officio Legati."—Regest. c. 6, x.
‖ "Licet . . . beneficiorum . . . plenaria dispositio ad Romanum noscatur Pontificem pertinere . . . collationem tamen . . . beneficiorum, apud Sedem Romanam vacantium, specialius cæteris antiqua consuetudo R. P. reservavit."—B. Clement. IV.

* Compare vol. v. p. 486; Eichhorn, iii. p. 507.
† They were likewise called "servitia communia et minuta."
‡ Extravagant. Cap. ii. de Prebend.

whole power of Reformation, so far at least as the Papal Court, into his own hands. Whatever he might hereafter concede to the Church in general, or to the separate nations of Christendom, was a boon on his part, not a right on theirs. Did the secret of this bold measure really lurk in this—that it appeared to be and was received as a declaration against all reform?

The Council saw its fatal error. In creating a Pope of high character, it had given itself a master. It might dictate to a John XXIII., it must submit to a Martin V. The Emperor himself had fallen into the second rank; the Pope took his seat as of course President of the Council. They were at the Pope's mercy. Their only hope was that his magnanimity, his gratitude, or his zeal for religion might prevail over his jealous care of his supremacy, that precious trust which had been handed down by so many generations of Popes, the unlimited Viceregency of God.

Yet the Nations would not abandon or relax their strenuous efforts for reform. The Germans presented a strong memorial; it contained eighteen articles, limiting the number of Cardinals, placing the Papal power under severe restrictions as to collation of benefices, Annates, Reservations, Appeals, the abuses of the Chancery and the Penitentiary, Exemptions, Unions, Commendams.[f] The French had been at first the most bold and earnest in their denunciations against the abuses in the Church. Gerson,

The plenary power which could bestow, could *dispense* with the duties of all benefices. It could permanently unite contiguous and poor benefices; it could excuse, on the pretext of higher duties, the duties of the member of the Capitular Body, of the parish Priest, even of the Bishop. Who but the Head of the Church could judge what was for the benefit of the Church? If this could be done in benefices with cure of souls, how much more when it was only the rule of a monastery, the seat in or the presidency of a Chapter, the stately and almost inactive charge of the Abbot, or the regular and ritual duty of the Canon or the Prebendary? Here the Prior, there the Vicar, might go through with sufficient decency the scanty or the mechanical services in the church, dream in the cloister, chant in the choir. The Pope would therefore less scruple to accumulate such benefices on his Cardinals, his officers, his courtiers, his favourites, whom he could commend to the formal election of the Chapter or the Monks, and permit to hold (in commendam), without once having visited the Convent or the Chapter, the Prebend, the Deanery, the portion of one or more monks, the Priorate, the Abbacy. Thus was all bound together in one complicated but subtly-enwoven system; and now wrested by the dexterous hand of Martin V. out of the hands of the spoiler.

[f] L'Enfant gives the articles, iii. p. 186, *et seqq.*

the Cardinal D'Ailly, Nicolas Clemangis,[g] had uttered terrible truths in language hardly less violent than Wycliffe or Huss. They had entreated the Emperor to enforce reform. Sigismund bitterly replied, "When we urged that reform should precede the election of a Pope, you scorned our judgement and insisted on first having a Pope. Lo, you have a Pope, implore him for reform. I had some power before a Pope was chosen, now I have none."[h] The Spaniards even threatened to return to the obedience of Pope Benedict; but they exhausted all their indignation in violent satires, which obtained great currency and vogue, were laughed at, and forgotten.[i]

The Pope acted with perfect address. He seemed to yield in the amplest manner. He submitted to the Nations a counter plan of Reformation, each article of which might have occupied the weary Council for months of hot debate. In the meantime, on the old maxim of ruling by the division of the adverse forces, he entered into negotiations for separate Concordats with each of the Transalpine nations. Italy had acquiesced at once in the Papal autocracy. Each of the other Nations had its usages, its institutions, its national character; each Nation, therefore, ought to have its peculiar ecclesiastical regulations, as concerned its relations to the Papacy. Thus it was no longer Christendom, no longer the whole Church, no longer the Council, the representative of the Church,

[g] De Clemangis, from Clemange, a village in the diocese of Chalons. See life prefixed to his Works, by Dupin, Gersoniana. Also his works *passim*, more especially his Declamatio de Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu. This must be read as a declamation. Clemangis begins with a golden age of the Church and of the world; as brilliant as their state in his own day was blackly coloured. His remorseless scourge spares neither Pope, nor Cardinals, nor Bishops, nor Priests, nor Monks, nor Friars, nor Nuns. No one can judge what things were written, and not by heresiarchs, but by pious churchmen, who does not read this work of Clemangis, the scholar of Gerson. "Si quis hodie desidiosus est, si quis a labore abhorrens, si quis in otio luxuriari volens, ad sacerdotium convolat, quo adepto, statim se cæteris sacerdotibus voluptatum sectatoribus adjungit, qui magis secundum Epicurum quam secundum Christum viventes, et cauponulas seduli frequentantes potando, commessando, pransitando, convivando, cum tesseris et pilâ ludendo tempora tota consumunt. Crapulati verò et inebriati pugnant, clamant, tumultuantur, nomen Dei et Sanctorum suorum pollutissimis labris execrantur. Sicque tandem compositi, ex meretricum suarum amplexibus ad divinum altare veniunt."—Oper. t. xvi. p. 16. See further on the corruption of French morals by the Papal court at Avignon; the Pluralities of the Cardinals.

[h] Gobelinus Persona, vi. p. 345.

[i] L'Enfant, ii. p. 190.

which was confronted with the Pope. Each kingdom stood alone to make the best terms in its power. So, too, the infringement, neglect, abrogation, of any of these articles, was no longer a breach of the great Canonical Law of Christendom, it became a matter of quarrel with one King, or one Nation, it concerned none other; it awoke no general indignation, was no breach of faith to the world at large. The League of Christendom for its common rights, common interests, common religion, was broken in pieces.

The Concordat with Germany (limited to five years) was vague, ambiguous, and left almost everything to the interpretation of the Pope. Cardinals were to be elected in moderate numbers. Some limitation was placed, but that indefinite, on the Pope's right of nominating to and confirming the larger vacant Benefices. Annates were to be levied according to the ancient taxation; Commendams were to be bestowed, Dispensations issued, Indulgences granted in more sparing and prudent measure.[k] Concordat with Germany;

That with England contained six even more meagre articles. Two of these stipulated that the inferior Prelates were not to wear the decorations of the higher—the mitre and sandals; that Englishmen should be admissible to offices in the Roman Court. with England;

Nor was that with France, though more diffuse, more full or unambiguous. No one of the nations by any authoritative act accepted these Concordats. with France.
France, by a royal edict, by a decree of her Parliaments, rejected hers with contempt.[m] It was presented by Martin, Bishop of Arras, before the Parliament of Paris, repudiated with unanimity.[n] The Parliament proclaimed the maintenance of the liberties of the Gallican Church, especially as to the collation of benefices, though prepared to contribute to the maintenance of the Popedom by moderate and necessary payments: it prohibited with the utmost rigour all payments whatever for Provisions, Annates, Vacancies, and such usurped powers.

It does not appear that the King or the Parliament of

[k] Art. de Indulgentiis. "Cavebit Romanus Papa in futurum nimiam Indulgentiarum effusionem, ne vilescant."

[m] Preuves des Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, c. xxii. No. 16.

[n] Von der Hardt, iv. 1567.

England deigned to notice the treaty passed in her name; her stern limitary laws stood unshaken, unrepealed.[o]

The work of the Council was done, or rather it had now no work to do. The Council was as anxious to be released from its weary imprisonment as the Pope to release it. The Council felt itself baffled, eluded, fallen under the inextricable dominion of the Pope. The Emperor was conscious that he had sunk to a subordinate position; his majesty was eclipsed. On the occasion of his solemn farewell the bitterness of his heart seemed to creep out. He declared his full obedience to the Pope; his submission to all the decrees of the Council. But if the Council had fallen into error he disclaimed all concern in it.[p] These significant words would bear various meanings, and were variously interpreted as alluding to the execution of Huss, the refusal to condemn Jean Petit and John of Falkenburg who in Poland had asserted the same execrable doctrines, the failure in the reformation of the Church. That miserable failure was admitted in all quarters.[q] The Pope kept up to the last his grave and stately dignity. On Whitsunday he officiated in the Cathedral with high pomp; countless multitudes thronged all night around the Episcopal Palace to receive his benediction: he showered indulgences on the enraptured thousands. The next day he set off for Geneva escorted by the Emperor, the whole city, and all the hierarchy who had not already taken their departure. He had refused the Emperor's pressing invitations to remain longer in Germany. The Council of Constance was at an end.[r]

[o] Compare the treatise of Clemangis, "De Annatis non Solvendis." He lays down the axiom, "Quia nullo statuto, privilegio, consuetudine, præscriptione, aut alio titulo potest induci, quod propter conferre aut consentire promotioni, aut electioni alicujus Monasterii vel Ecclesiæ Cathedralis, sive ut præficiatur administrationi prælaturæ, beneficio, sive Ecclesiæ, aliquid posset vel debeat peti vel exigi, eo quod secundum Apostolicas et Canonicas traditiones, clarissime foret *Simoniacum*." It is curious that there is frequent appeal to English usage.—Oper. p. 85.

[p] Von der Hardt, iv. p. 1563. L'Enfant, ii. 248.

[q] "Sunt tamen quædam reformata, quamvis respectu conceptorum pauca, verbis quidem et scriptis quæ propter humanam mentis mutabilitatem, divinitatis excusantem se sub umbrâ, hic inserere non præsumo." — Gobelinus Persona, p. 355.

[r] The Council had sat for three years and six months without a tumult in the streets, without rise in the price of provisions, without any epidemic or contagious malady.

The Council of Constance threatened to shake, might seem to have shaken, the Papal supremacy to its foundations; but for a time it strengthened rather than enfeebled its authority. It compelled the election of a Pope, whose character, irreproachable, if not imposing from learning and sanctity, recovered the waning reverence of Christendom. Nor was it till the next century, when the Popes had become powerful temporal sovereigns, when the Italian wars had almost quenched the last awe of religion, when the struggle for dominion between the great conflicting powers of Europe, France, the Empire, Spain, England, made Italy the battle-field of the world; it was not till then that the Popes sank again to the moral level, or lower than the level of Italian Princes, or temporal potentates, and that an Alexander VI. could be endured on the throne of St. Peter. It had been established indeed that there was a tribunal which in extreme cases might depose a Pope. But then it must be during a schism, among contending Popes, each with a doubtful title, or at farthest a Pope flagrantly defective in faith or morals. But the right in the Council to reform the Church in its head as well as its members, to impose restrictions on the all-enacting, all-abrogating, all self-executing power of the Popedom, this right, which there can be no doubt was asserted by the Council, remained a barren, abstract proposition, to be again asserted, but asserted in vain, in the Council of Basle. Still the Pope claimed, exercised the prerogative of issuing Canons for the universal obedience of Christendom, and of giving to Papal Decrees the infallible authority of the Gospel, of God himself. Pope Martin quietly resumed all the unreyoked authority which the Christian world had yielded to Innocent III., or even to Boniface VIII. No single Canon, not one of the Extravagants of Boniface, not one even of the Clementine Decretals was annulled; every precedent remained in force. The Concordats granted by the will of the Pope, feeble guarantees as they were for the liberties of national churches, or against abuses, might be abrogated or fall into desuetude. Of what force were they against what was averred to be the ancient, immemorial, irrepealable privileges of the Roman See?

The Council had given its sanction, its terrible sanction, to the immutability of the whole dominant creed of Christendom, to the complete indefeasible hierarchical system. It had declared implacable war against all who should revolt, not only from the doctrine but from the discipline of the Church. One part of the sacerdotal order might aspire to greater freedom, but the slightest emancipation of mankind from the rule of the sacerdotal order entered not into the thoughts, hardly into the apprehensions, of the Fathers of Constance. In the execution of Huss and Jerome of Prague there had been awful unanimity. Few foresaw, still fewer had they foreseen would have shrunk from, the horrors of the Bohemian war, in which it was first shown in a whole nation, how much more dreadful is the collision of hostile fanaticisms than the worst strife of temporal interests or principles. Bohemia as a province of the Christian world in insurrection against the unity of the Church, was even more beyond the pale of mercy than a heathen land. The Christian duty, the Christian justice of enforcing belief in the Gospel on the wild and yet unconverted races in the North of Germany was debated, and with strong resistance, by the more tolerant. Few of those who fought, or drove others to fight with Ziska and Procopius, doubted the holiness, the imperative obligation of battling against these heresiarchs to the death.

Martin V. travelled slowly through Italy. He accepted the splendid hospitalities of Florence, now at the height of her power, and proud to receive the Supreme Pontiff as her guest. The grateful, yet poor or parsimonious Pope, had no other return to make but the elevation of Florence to an Archiepiscopate. At Florence John XXIII. having, by the Pope's desire, been transferred from a German to an Italian prison, though he had once made his escape, now quieted the apprehensions of his rival by throwing himself at his feet, expressing the deepest contrition for all his sins, and abdicating his last hold on the Papacy in the most full and humiliating terms. Martin felt the policy as well as the generosity of mercy. Balthasar Cossa, after a few days

Martin at Florence. Feb. 26, 1419.

May 13.

of austere penance, was named Cardinal and the Head of the Sacred College. But his eventful life drew to its end: he died, worn out; it was said that his last humiliation preyed on his weary spirit. He was buried with great pomp at the expense of the Republic. His tomb is still seen under the noble dome of Florence. Benedict XIII. closed at length his stubborn career at Peniscola. He had still two partisans, whom he dignified with the name of Cardinals; faithful to the memory of their patron the two Cardinals proceeded to elect a successor, a canon of Barcelona. Martin was wise enough to dispel this phantom of a Pontiff by mild measures. The Antipope sank willingly into the Bishop of Majorca.

Death of John XXIII.; of Benedict XIII.

Martin was undisputed Pope; but in the Papal territory he was not master of a single city. Besides the kingdoms and dukedoms, Naples and Milan, the Republics, Venice and Florence, the independent lords of other cities, a new Power had arisen to still greater height—the Captains of the Free Companies, who had carved themselves out principalities, which they maintained by the bands of their mercenary followers. Braccio Montone occupied the greater part of the Papal dominions.[s] Pope Martin had recognised the title of Joanna II., the inheritress of the name, the throne, the licentiousness, the misfortunes of Joanna I., to the throne of Naples. In return the famous Condottiero, Ludovico Sforza, hereafter to be more famous, now at the head of his own bands and those of Naples, advanced as Gonfalonier of the Church to expel Braccio Montone from the territory of St. Peter. But Sforza, or rather Sforza's ally Tartaglia, whom he had seduced from Braccio, suffered a disastrous defeat; the Pope was compelled to make terms, through the mediation of Florence, with the triumphant Braccio.[t] To Florence Braccio came;

[s] Of Braccio Montone, Æneas Sylvius writes that one side of his body was palsied. He was eloquent and facetious. "Blandus eloquio, crudelis opere. De clavibus Ecclesiæ, de Christo, de Deo nihil timuit, ut qui animam cum corpore extingui Epicurea dementia credidit," —Vit. Freder. III. apud Kollar, ii. p. 1541.

[t] Muratori, sub ann. 1419. Braccio affected to become a sort of Cæsar. He was reported to have said that he would reduce Pope Martin so low that he would say six masses for a piece of

the fickle city contrasted the magnificence, the frank bearing, the lavish expenditure, the feasts and tournaments of the adventurer, with the cold and severe dignity, the poverty of the Pontiff. Popular songs were current to the glory of the soldier, the shame of the Pope. The children sang two verses under the window, which taunted at once his worthlessness and his penury.[u] Martin made haste to reconcile the powerful Braccio with the Church. Braccio restored Orvieto, Narni, Terni, and Orta to the Pope; he held as a fief under the sovereignty of the Church Perugia, Assisi, Iesi, Todi, and other towns. He compelled
June, 1420. Bologna to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Pope, and to admit a Papal garrison.

It was not till late in the following year that Pope Martin ventured to return to his native city to
Sept. 22, 1421. the palace of the Popes. The Roman and the Pope might behold with the profoundest sorrow the state of the Eternal City. It was difficult to say during many late years whether the presence or the absence of her Pontiffs had been most disastrous. On every side he beheld tottering houses, churches in ruins, deserted streets, the whole
Martin in Rome. city a mass of filth and rubbish, the inhabitants wasting away with poverty and dearness of provisions.[x] The citizens looked like strangers, or like an immigration of the dregs of all people. An inundation of the Tiber, of more than usual height and violence, soon after his arrival, added to the wretchedness; the waters came up to the high altar of the Pantheon. If there were great discontents in the Papal territories at the heavy taxation; if the Pope was accused, and too justly accused, in his later days of avarice, and of having left a vast treasure in the hands of his kindred;[y] if he infringed, for the sake of

silver. A Florentine reproached Braccio with this speech. "Six masses for a piece of silver! I would not give him a piece of copper for a thousand." See the account of his death and burial.—Æneas Sylvius, ibid.

[u] "Papa Martino,
Non vale un quattrino."

Pope Martin,
Not worth a farthing.
Muratori, Ann. sub ann.

[x] Platina, Vit. Martini V.

[y] Voigt has printed, in the Historisches Taschenbuch for 1833, a very curious paper, called "Stimmen aus Rom über dem Papstlichen Hof im 15ten Jahrhundert." It is compiled from more than 100 inedited letters from the ambassadors or procurators of the Teutonic Order at Rome. They were mostly written by persons who had long resided there, and are confidential, business-

filling the Papal coffers, on the Concordats extorted from him at Constance; in Rome if he treated the Cardinals with overbearing haughtiness, even harshness,[2] Martin V. was honoured during his life, and after a pontificate of fourteen years followed to his splendid sepulchre by the whole people of Rome, by the Clergy of all ranks, lamenting the Father of the city. Rome under him had risen from her ruins, populous, prosperous, again the capital of the Christian world.

Italian politics.

During the whole of this period the Colonna, of one of the old princely houses of Italy, the lord of a great territory, the Pope, could not but be mingled up in the intricate, versatile, and treacherous politics of Italy. Martin, not more embarrassed than the other temporal sovereigns, or the ambitious Republics, by gratitude to allies, or fidelity to treaties, in the renewed strife between the houses of Arragon and Anjou for the throne of Naples, in the long wars between the Visconti, Duke of

like, passionless letters. These ambassadors at first lived in great state; had 2000 ducats income; they had nine horses and a mule (the Cardinals were constantly borrowing their horses). In 1430 they were cut down to six, to the great diminution, as they remonstrate, of their influence. The ambassador of the Hospitallers had but three horses, and their affairs could not get on at all. The ambassador of the Teutonic Order was always in special connection with some one Cardinal, the protector of the Order (p. 89, &c.). The protector was to be propitiated and kept to his duty by perpetual and very costly presents in money, plate, jewels, horses. On those gifts there are many very curious particulars. So, too, on the venality of all, from the Pope and Cardinals downwards. One, after many others in like tone, sums up in one brief sentence: "Wer da mehr giebt der hat auch mehr recht" (p. 97). "'How is it,'" writes one ambassador, "you inquire, 'that the Poles have every thing their own way?' Because they spend more money. This year"—1411, before the Council of Constance—"they have spent 20,000 ducats. . . . The Pope has yearly from the Order 400 ducats." . . . In 1420 (Pope Martin is on the throne), "the Pope has said thrice to me, 'Come to me alone, without your Cardinal; I will be protector of the Order.' I knew well what he meant, and sent him a handsome present, as a welcome on his return to Rome. He took it most willingly" (p. 101). In 1429 the Pope claimed the right of appointing a Master of the Order, as every one saw, to bring more money to himself. "One or two Cardinals can do nothing; we must reach the Pope himself, which cannot be done without money and presents." The Pope was very jealous of the presentation to all the benefices in Prussia and Livonia possessed by the Order: he would have them or their worth in money. See, too, the list of Christmas-boxes to the Pope, Cardinals, and others (p. 107):—A blue velvet cloth for the Pope, 88 ducats; a gold cup, 64 ducats; 13 silver spoons for the Pope's chamberlains, 117 ducats . . . Comfits for the Cardinals and Auditors, 70 and 31 ducats . . . for the Pope's groom, 3 ducats; a horse for a present, 30 ducats. Each Pope had his favourite, who was bribed at a higher price; with Martin V., first, the Patriarch of Grado—later, Herman, his Protonotary (p. 128). The whole correspondence is very unfavourable to Martin V., to his pride and rapacity (p. 171).

[2] See on, p. 21.

Milan, and Venice and Florence, calmly pursued his own interests and those of his See. The Papal territories, if heavily burthened with imposts, at least escaped the ravages of foreign war, and were no longer desolated by the wanton pillage of the Free Companies. Bologna alone rose for her freedom; but the signal was not hailed by the neighbouring cities. The Bentivogli came into power, but were obliged to acknowledge at least the restricted lordship of the Pope. They were goaded to a second insurrection by the massacre of some of their house by the Legate, and a second time under Eugenius IV. reconciled to the Church.

Towards Transalpine Christendom Martin V., safe on his throne at Rome, resumed all the haughty demeanour and language of former Pontiffs. He interfered in the disposal of the wealthy benefices of Germany. In England he heard with indignation, and endeavoured by the most vigorous remonstrances to repress, the growing spirit of independence. The Church in England had plunged headlong into the wars of France. If the Primate Chicheley[a] did not instigate, he urged, he justified the iniquitous claim of Henry V. to the throne of France. The lavish subsidies of the Church were bestowed with unexampled readiness and generosity for these bloody campaigns. It was more than gratitude to the House of Lancaster for their firm support of the Church, and the statute for burning heretics; it was a deliberate diversion, a successful one, of the popular passions to a foreign war, from their bold and resolute aggressions on the Church.[b] What torrents of blood could be too deep, what amount of misery too great to avert such danger! But the Church in England had enough to do

[a] Archbishop Chicheley was ambassador to Gregory XII. at Sienna; at Lucca he was appointed by the Pope, by way of provision, Bishop of St. David's. He was at the Council of Pisa, and assenting to the degradation of Gregory XII. He was Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414. The Pope claimed the right of provision, but named the prelate designated by the crown, and elected by the monks. —Life of Chicheley. London, 1789.

[b] Shakspeare in the first scene of Henry V. speaks the language of the chronicles, the chronicles the language of history. The allusion to the famous petition, which the poet makes a bill (see p. 146), is curious. Is there Parliamentary authority for this?—

"That self-same Bill is urged,
Which in the eleventh year of the last king's reign
Was like and had indeed against us passed,
But that the scambling and unquiet time
Did push it out of farther question."

Henry V., Act I. Scene 1.

to look to itself; it could not be equally vigilant or self-sacrificing for the interests of the Pope. Henry V., like his predecessor, and his Parliament held the law in their own hands. The nation fully concurred, or had rather enforced the constitutional opposition to the Papal power. The statute of Præmunire remained among the laws of the realm. It could no longer be overlooked by the Church of Rome. To Chicheley, still Archbishop of Canterbury, Martin addressed a grave missive, reproving in the harshest terms his criminal remissness, his treacherous cowardice.[c] "By this execrable statute the King of England has so entirely usurped the spiritual jurisdiction, as if our Saviour had constituted him his Vicar. He makes laws for the Church and the Order of the Clergy; draws the cognisance of ecclesiastical causes to the temporal courts; makes provision about clerks, benefices, and the concerns of the Hierarchy, as if he held the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as if the administration of these affairs were with the King, not with St. Peter. Besides these hideous encroachments he has enacted terrible penalties against the Clergy: Jews and Saracens are not treated with so much severity. People of all persuasions, of all countries, have the liberty of coming into England; except those who have cures bestowed upon them by the Supreme Bishop, by the Vicar of Christ Jesus. Those only are banished, arrested, imprisoned, stripped of their fortunes. Proctors or notaries charged with the execution of the mandates or censures of the Apostolic See, if they venture to set foot on English ground, and proceed in the fulfilment of their commission, are treated as the King's enemies, cast out of the King's protection, exposed to the extremest hardships. . . . . Is this a Catholic kingdom? If any discipline or Apostolic censure is urged against this usage it is treated as a capital offence." The Archbishop is reminded that he is the successor of the glorious martyr St. Thomas. In the following year the Pope addressed the Parliament of England; and in a second letter to the Archbishop accused him of having

Statute of Præmunire.

A.D. 1427.

[c] Raynaldus, sub ann. 1426. Collier, E. H. B. vii. p. 633. Henry VI. was on the throne.

irreverently and wickedly declared in public that the Apostolic See sought the abolition of that statute only from sordid pecuniary motives.

Cardinal Beaufort.

But Martin V., perhaps inadvertently, had wounded the pride and infringed on the dignity of the Anglican Primate. Henry of Beaufort, it has been seen, the King's uncle, on his return from the Holy Land, had done good service at the Council of Constance[d] by his mediation between the conflicting parties. The Pope had rewarded him by creating him Cardinal of Winchester and Apostolic Legate in England. This usurpation on the Legatine power, of late held by Chicheley, and on the undisputed Primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, could not be tamely endured. Chicheley had obtained from Henry V. a prohibition to the Bishop of Winchester to exercise Legatine power in England. The Regency, during the minority of Henry VI., would not receive Beaufort with the honours due to his rank, and demanded that he should surrender his Bishopric of Winchester, vacated by his acceptance of the Cardinalate. This Churchman had been appointed Captain-General of a crusade against the Hussites in Bohemia. The iniquity of this act, the employment of such a man in such a service (what said the Lollards in England?), brought its own shame and punishment. Beaufort raised money and troops in England for the crusade.[e] By a scandalous and intricate fraud these troops were poured into France to consolidate, defend, or advance the progress of the English arms under the Duke of Bedford. The King of France sent the bitterest complaints to Rome; Pope Martin was compelled to condemn this act of the Cardinal as injurious to the cause of religion, highly dishonourable to the See of Rome;[f] but Henry of Winchester did after all better service in Bohemia than all the Princes and Generals of the Empire. The English churchman, by his courage, put to shame the whole panic-stricken host.[g] Beaufort returned to plunge into the politics of England, the implacable

[d] Dr. Lingard has inadvertently written Basil.—Hist. of England.

[e] Rymer.

[f] Compare Lingard, Hist. of England.

[g] See on, page 249.

antagonist of him who was called the good Duke of Gloucester. Beaufort is that Cardinal consigned—in some degree perhaps unjustly consigned—to everlasting torment by a decree, as far as the estimation of mankind, more powerful than Papal. His death of despair, described by Shakspeare, painted by Reynolds, is indelibly imprinted on the mind of man.[h]

Archbishop Chicheley strove to maintain a middle course. He could not defy the Pope; he knew that he could not annul the law of England. He urged on a Parliament at Westminster the terrors of a Papal interdict on the land. The Parliament paid no further regard to these terrors than to petition the Pope to restore the Primate of England to his favour.[i]

Martin V. by no means openly rejected the yet imperious demand for reformation, which beyond the Alps had not relaxed its importunity; nor was he disposed altogether to elude that regular convocation of General Councils, at stated intervals, to which he had agreed before the dissolution of that at Constance. By the decree of Constance, confirmed by the Pope, Councils were to be held every five years. Pavia had been appointed as the seat of the next meeting. Accordingly, in the year 1423, a Council opened at Pavia, but it was attended only by Italian Prelates. The Transalpines either were afraid or unwilling to trust themselves and their cause on Italian ground; or perhaps they had intimation of an affair, to them comparatively of less interest, but which the Pope intended, as of more vital importance, at least to Papal Christendom, to supplant the general Reformation—the reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church. The Greek Emperor, pressed by the Ottoman Turks almost to the utmost, was inclined to buy the aid of the West by the surrender of his religious freedom: the Pope contemplated with lofty expectation the whole world

Council of Pavia. A.D. 1423.

[h] Compare the House of Lancaster.—The sensible author concludes in favour of Beaufort, "that he was not much better nor much worse than the other Romish dignitaries of the fifteenth century." This as regards England is not quite fair in the times of Wykeham and Hallam. I cannot in Chicheley forget the munificent founder of All-Souls, Oxford.

[i] Wilkins, Concilia.—Collier, i. 656.

reposing under his supremacy. Martin V. ere long evoked the Council of Pavia to Sienna: there he might take part in the proceedings, and urge on more vigorously the reconciliation of the Greeks. At Sienna appeared only five German Prelates, from France six, from Spain not one; but even this Council, after renewing the condemnation of Wycliffe, Huss, and their doctrines, came to an unwelcome resolution, that internal Church union by reform ought to take precedence of external union. The suffrages of the Nations were so decidedly in favour of this decree that the Pope took alarm at the dangerous spirit of innovation universal throughout Christendom: "that the Supreme Pontiff should be called to account was a perilous thing."[k] Martin seized the specious pretext that so few Prelates could not pretend to represent the Church, as an occasion for the dissolution of the Council.[m] It was prorogued for seven years, then to meet in the German city of Basle.

Sienna.

Martin V. just lived to see the opening of the Council of Basle. An apoplexy carried him off suddenly, and left to his successor that conflict with the Council which might perhaps have been avoided or mitigated by the experience, dexterity, and conciliatory manners of Pope Martin.

A.D. 1431.

[k] "Noverat oculatus Pontifex omnem multitudinem novitatis cupidam esse, iniqua in Romanos Pontifices judicia plebis, invidos patres, nihil periculosius quam maximi præsulatus reddere rationem. Arte igitur usus est." p. 34.— Æneæ Sylvii Comment. This work of Æneas Sylvius was first published at Rome by C. Fea, 1823. It is of great importance; I owe the use of it to my excellent friend the Chevalier Bunsen.

[m] Bull of Dissolution, March 12, 1424.

CHAPTER XI.

EUGENIUS IV. THE HUSSITE WAR.

MARTIN V., by the aggrandisement of his family, had not established a predominant influence in the Conclave for the house of Colonna, nor even for the Roman clergy. The Cardinals met; they had been unduly depressed as they thought, doubtless kept in stern subordination, by Martin V.[a] Their first business was to erect themselves into a standing Council, superior to the Pope, so that without their advice the Pope could do nothing. They solemnly pledged themselves, whoever should be elected to the Popedom, to reform the Roman Court, in its head and in its members, with the Council of the Cardinals; not to remove it from Rome; to hold a General Council at intervals according to the decree of Constance; not to create Cardinals, or to do any important act without the advice of the Cardinals; to the Cardinals was to be assigned one moiety of the whole Papal revenue.[b] All took this oath without hesitation, and kept it as the Cardinals were wont to keep such oaths.[b] They then proceeded to the election. The contest lay between a Spaniard and a French Prelate. Neither would make concessions. Both parties threw away their suffrages on one whom none of the College desired or expected to succeed: their concurrent votes fell by chance on the Cardinal of Sienna.[c] Conclave.

[a] They (five Cardinals well disposed to the Teutonic Order, Orsini, Arles, De Comte, Rouen, Novara) dare not speak one word to the Pope but what he would willingly hear; for the Pope has so repressed the Cardinals that they never speak except according to his sentiments, and while they speak turn red and pale.—Voigt, Stimmen, p. 74. When Martin fled from Rome to Ferentino on account of the plague, he would not let a single Cardinal come near him.

[b] Raynald. sub ann. 1431.

[c] Andreas Billius, Hist. Mediolan. Sismondi has represented Eugenius IV. as the most insignificant of all the Cardinals. Yet he had filled offices of high trust. He had been Legate in Romagna. —Platina, in Vitâ.

Gabriel Condolmieri, Cardinal of Sienna, was the nephew, on a sister's side, of the abdicated Gregory XII.: he took the name of Eugenius IV.[d] Bred a monk of the rigid Cœlestine Order, Eugenius had the narrow virtues of a monk, austere morals, rigorous discharge of the offices of devotion. He had likewise the hardness, self-sufficiency, stubbornness of a monk. His sudden elevation gave him overweening confidence in his own judgement: he implicitly believed in his own supremacy, and that he was invested by that supremacy in wisdom to maintain it. This was to him his one great duty, one paramount virtue. He was not averse to the reformation of the Church; he would willingly have submitted the whole clergy to the same austere discipline to which he had subdued his own person; but it must be reformation issuing from himself, granted by himself, regulated by himself; nor would he make any concession which would detract from the Papal power, hardly from the Papal wealth. To this all considerations of policy, humanity, fidelity to engagements, must be subordinate. He had the singular praise that he religiously observed all compacts, except those which it was for the advantage of his See to violate.[e] In policy, indeed, Eugenius IV. was a Venetian. He broke up at once the alliance maintained so successfully, as regarded the peace of Rome and the Roman territory, with the Visconti and Milan, and joined Florence and Venice with all his power. To war against his own refractory subjects, or against the enemies of his allies in Italy, Eugenius IV. had no scrupulous aversion. His panegyrist acknowledges his love of war;[f] but it was above all war against heretics, an exterminating war, war which admitted of no treaty. Against heretics it was religion to annul, infringe, tread under foot any compact; against them cruelty was mercy, perfidy justice. Yet there were those

March 3, 1431. Eugenius IV.

[d] The ambassador of the Teutonic Order deplores the parsimony of the Order, which will not enable him to vie in his gifts with other sovereigns. "The Venetians are used to gifts."—p. 110.

[e] "Constans præterea in pactis servandis est habitus, nisi quid pollicitus fuisset quod revocare quam perficere satius esset."—Platina.

[f] "Bella autem ita amavit, quod mirum in Pontifice videbatur."—Vit. Eugen. apud Muratori, S. R. I.

who, to their admiration of the beauty of the person of Eugenius, added that of his virtue and his equanimity.[g]

Eugenius began his Pontificate with an act of resolute violence, perhaps unavoidable, but which ungraciously exposed the one great vice of his predecessor, and ended in the most offensive condemnation of his memory. The vast wealth accumulated by Martin was in the hands of the Colonnas, the Cardinal Prospero, Antonio Prince of Salerno, Edward Count of Celano. The Pope demanded the surrender of these treasures, the inalienable inheritance of the See. He stood in need of them, for all Romagna was in revolt; Perugia had driven out the Legate; Viterbo, Civita Castellana, Spoleto, Narni, Todi, were in arms. The Colonnas refused to disgorge their treasures. They fortified their castles; they proclaimed the Pope only a servile instrument in the hands of their enemies the Orsini; they broke with armed bands into the fiefs held by the Orsini, and laid all waste; but Rome was still in that state of loyal excitement which always followed for a short time the election of a new Pope. The love and reverence of Pope Martin were buried with him in his grave: it adhered not to his house. The Pope had power enough at his command to seize all the Colonnas in Rome. His vengeance was unscrupulous: he tortured Otho, the treasurer of Pope Martin, an aged man, till he expired; two hundred Roman citizens perished on the scaffold;[h] the palace of Martin V. was razed to the ground; his arms effaced from all public monuments. Florence and Venice, the new Pope's new allies, sent aid. The Prince of Salerno was attacked on all sides; his garrisons were ignominiously driven from the forts which he had seized; he was compelled to humiliating submission; all that remained of the treasures of Pope Martin, 75,000 golden florins, were surrendered to the Pope.[i] These vigorous measures secured to Eugenius the peaceable pos-

First acts of Eugenius IV.

Sept. 22, 1431.

[g] Antoninus of Florence; see also Æneas Sylvius, Europa, i. 48. Compare Weissenberg, ii. p. 280.

[h] Muratori, Ann. d' Italia, sub ann. 1431; Vita Eugenii Papæ, S. R. I. iv.

[i] In the Stimmen aus Rom, Eugenius is favourably contrasted with Martin V. On the occasion of a favourable decree, the ambassador writes, "I must have paid Pope Martin 1000 ducats more for this."—p. 114.

session of Rome for two years, the last of which witnessed the coronation of the Emperor Sigismund.

This first success was followed by the subjugation of the Roman States. City after city yielded to the combined troops of the Free Companies in the pay of the Pope, of Florence, and of Venice, until the implacable and inexhaustible intrigues of the Duke of Milan raised again the banner of revolt. These triumphs at Rome were not likely to disenchant Pope Eugenius from his full faith in himself and in his Pontifical power. So plunged he at once into that long irreconcileable contest with Transalpine Christendom, from which however he might seem to emerge conqueror, and to bear down all resistance by stubborn resolution, his victory was dearly won, though its results might wait almost another century to come to maturity.

Now for the first time a Council beyond the Alps, that of Basle, stood up boldly on democratic principles, first against the Pope alone, afterwards against the Pope with a rival Council. At length the Transalpine Council set up its own Pope, and two Popes at the head of two General Councils distracted the worship and divided the obedience of Christendom.

The Hussite war had already almost filled the whole period of more than thirteen years, from the close of the Council of Constance to the opening of the Council of Basle. It lasted during all the Pontificate of Martin V., who contemplated it far aloof, if with horror and dismay, it is to be hoped, not without some commiseration; though he might think it his duty to stimulate it and keep it alive with all his authority. Safe in Rome, he heard but from a distance the thundering roll of Ziska's chariots, the shrieks of cities stormed, the wail of armies mowed down by the scythe. The war was still raging on at the accession of Eugenius, and at the meeting of the Council of Basle.[k] They were years of terrible and fatal glory in the history of Bohemia, of achievements marvellous as to valour, military skill, patriotism, and the passion for civil

A.D. 1418-1431.

[k] Compare in Palacky (Geschichte Böhmens) references to the MS. Histories of John of Ragusa and John of Segovia, iii. p. 518. Also in Martine and Durand, viii. 48, the Articles placarded in Rome demanding the Council, as the only means of putting an end to the Hussite war.

and religious freedom; to the Empire, to the Teutonic nation, beyond all precedent disastrous and ignominious. Had Bohemia possessed a race of native Sovereigns; were it not in the nature of profound religious fanaticism to awaken differences irreconcileable under the most favourable circumstances; could Bohemia have consolidated her own strength within herself, and not carried fire and sword into the Empire, she might have been the first nation which threw off the yoke of the Pope and of the hierarchy, the centre of Sclavonian independence. But that Sclavonian Reformation might perhaps have retarded, from the hostility of the two races, embittered by the long contest, the later, more successful, more irrevocable Teutonic emancipation.

Of all wars none was so horribly, remorselessly, ostentatiously cruel as this—a war of races, of languages, and of religion. It was a strife of revenge, of reprisal, of extermination, considered to be the holiest of duties. On one side no faith was to be kept, no mercy shown to heretics: to cut off the spreading plague by any means was paramount to all principles of law or gospel. On the other, vengeance was to be wreaked on the enemies of God's people, and therefore the enemies of God; to root out idolatry was the mission of the Bohemians; mortal sin was to be cut off with the righteous sword; and the whole priesthood, all monks, friars, nuns, were so utterly depraved, according to their sweeping condemnation, that it was only to fulfil the Divine commandment to extirpate the irreclaimable Order. These terrible theories were relentlessly carried into more terrible practice. Kuttenberg, the second city in the realm, the rival of Prague, Catholic and German as Prague was Hussite and Bohemian, burned, beheaded, hanged all who would not retract their opinions. They bought the prisoners taken in war for a few groschens a head (five times as much for a preacher as for a common man), and executed them without trial, without mercy. They are charged with having put to death sixteen hundred men.[m] The Hussites, wherever they could, perpetrated horrible reprisals; for so

Atrocity of the war.

[m] Palacky, iii. 74-5.

many of their brethren as were burned, they hanged as many monks or friars.[n] The names assigned to their fortresses, and assumed by the more fanatic Hussites, Taborites, Horebites — show from which part of the Bible they drew their prevailing principles. Some of the preachers proclaimed the approaching end of the world. Christ was already coming, already come. The enemies of truth were to be exterminated; the good alone preserved, and put in the five faithful cities.[o] Bohemia boasted, beyond all kingdoms of Europe, of her magnificent religious buildings, not in her cities alone, but in her villages. Fanaticism, maddened by persecution and by its own blind fury, warred on all that was splendid. The sky-aspiring churches, of vast length and width, on their pillars and arching vaults of stone, the stately altars, where the reliques of the saints were enshrined in gold and silver, the embroidered vestments inlaid with precious stones, the gorgeous vessels, the rich painted windows—all was demolished—all was ruin, havoc, desolation.[p]

The execution of John Huss and Jerome of Prague had aroused a general access of national as well as religious indignation. But so long as King Wenzel lived the Bohemian insurrection had not attained its height. For Wenzel was a Bohemian in heart, as a Bohemian beloved by the people, and supposed, though he outwardly supported the old religion, not to be unfavourable to, at least he had taken no decided or violent part against the new doctrines. But on the death of Wenzel, the hereditary claim of Sigismund to the throne of Bohemia was undoubted—of Sigismund who had allowed his safe-conduct to be violated, and so was guilty

Death of Wenzel, Aug. 16, 1419.

Accession of Sigismund.

[n] For the atrocity of the war, see the revolting account of the taking of Prachalic by Ziska, Palacky, p. 171.

[o] Palacky, from Brezowa.

[p] Thus writes Æneas Sylvius, who had visited Bohemia: "Nullum vero regnum ætate nostrâ in totâ Europâ tam frequentibus, tam augustis, tam ornatis templis ditatum fuisse quam Bohemicum reor. Templa in cœlum erecta, longitudine atque amplitudine mirabili fornicibus tegebantur lapideis; altaria in sublimi posita, auro et argento quo sanctorum reliquiæ tegebantur onusta; sacerdotum vestes margaritis textæ; ornatus omnis dives, pretiosissima supellex, fenestræ altæ atque amplissimæ vitro et admirabili opere lucem præbebant. Neque hæc tantum in oppidis atque urbibus sed in villis quoque admirari licebat."—Hist. Bohemia. c. 36. Bohemia bears sad witness to this revolution. Except the St. John Nepomuk on the Hradshin, all her churches are of the later Jesuit style.

of the death of the martyrs, even if he had taken no more active share in the murder. The act had been a breach of faith, an outrage to the Bohemian nation. Sigismund attempted to awe the reluctant kingdom to obedience. At Breslau he revenged an insurrection with such terrible severity, that Prague might stand aghast at the peril of resisting, or of receiving such a master. He burned without scruple all the heretical teachers that fell into his hands. John Kincha, a member of the Town Council at Prague, was dragged at horses' tails; and after all this savage usage, died on the scaffold with the recklessness of a martyr. Two days after this, the Pope's Legate, Ferdinand of Lucca, published the Bull for the Crusade. March 17, 1420.

Bohemia, following the example of Prague, rose at once and repudiated the sovereignty of Sigismund. She had no native Prince to fight her battles. Hussinetz, who secretly aimed at the throne, perhaps fortunately for his country, died at an early period. Somewhat later the crown was accepted and worn by a Lithuanian Prince, Sigismund Korybert, finally deposed and expelled the land by the common consent of the nation.[q] But the armies of Bohemia needed no royal leaders. We must pass with rapidity, we cannot altogether avert our eyes from those terrible but noble scenes, the victories of Ziska and Procopius. The first crusade ended with the disgraceful defeat, with the shameful flight of the Emperor from the walls of Prague,[r] and the disastrous battle of Wyschebrad.[s] The second campaign saw the German army break up in panic flight from Saaz, with the now renowned and irresistible Ziska in the rear, bearing down whole squadrons, and revenging the unspeakable barbarities inflicted on his countrymen. The third year Sigismund advanced into Moravia at the head of the The war. Battle of Wyschebrad, Nov. 1, 1420; of Saaz, Sept. 1, 1421:

[q] In 1427.

[r] Aschbach, iii. 47; compare his authorities with Palacky, iii. 91. The camp broke up July 30. Sigismund had gone through the idle ceremony of coronation.

[s] The spirited poem in Palacky taunts Sigismund with personal cowardice:—

"Wie ein Has vor Hunden hof er,
Hätte Flügel er besessen.
Wär furwahr er fortgeflogen;
Solch ein tapfres Herze hatt' er.
Herr von sieben Königreichen."—p. 163.

Hungarian forces; they too fled at once at the approach of Ziska with his wild war-chariots; they were overtaken at Deutschbrod, and massacred rather than routed by the remorseless conqueror. Bohemia seemed to be severed, and for ever, from Latin unity. Conrad, the Archbishop of Prague, accepted, to the utter astonishment and dismay of the Church, the four articles of Prague.[t]

of Deutschbrod, Jan., 1422.

Jan. 1422.

Internal feuds were sure to break out immediately that the enemy was beyond the borders of Bohemia. The wealthy burghers of Prague (the nobles had entered the strife with reluctance) would have accepted a moderate share of religious independence. The four articles of Prague stipulated, I. For freedom of teaching by their own ministers throughout the realm. II. Communion in both kinds. III. That the clergy should not hold estates, nor mingle in secular affairs. IV. The punishment of deadly sins by the magistrates, with the suppression of indulgences for money. Whoever should compel them to abandon either of these articles they declared to be a most cruel tyrant, an Antichrist.[u] They were called the Utraquists, as insisting on the Eucharist in both elements. Ziska[x] and the Taborites had wilder and loftier views: the national independence, far harsher measures to the clergy. There were among them, millenarians, communists. They swept away every vestige of traditional religion; everything but the barest, most unadorned worship. But to the old creed they still adhered with stern fidelity. Martinet Hauska and his followers were burned by both parties for denying Transubstantiation, or the Real Presence.[y] But neither these divisions nor the death of Ziska by the plague, weakened the indomitable resistance of the Bohemians to their foreign foes. No sooner had the crusading army again crossed the borders, than the nation was one; the din of polemic strife was silent. The moderate party followed the Taborites to the field under their new gene-

Articles of Prague.

Oct. 12, 1424.

[t] Palacky, page 218.

[u] See Articles.—Palacky, 190.

[x] Laurent Bzov. p. 175. The character of Ziska in Palacky (p. 360, &c.) is just and striking. He was as stern a bigot for Christian virtue as his enemies for their Christian creed or discipline.

[y] Palacky, 236.

ral, almost the equal of Ziska in military skill. The blind Procopius, the shaven Procopius,[z] had been a priest;[a] under him the old Taborites, and the Orphans, the followers of Ziska, their lost father, as well as his own peculiar religious and political faction, met together in fierce, unconflicting unity. Under him the third crusade, which had lingered on for two or three years, was discomfited in the final battle of Aussitz. So total was the rout, that the Germans, not without cause, dreaded the irruption of these formidable conquerors into their own territories. Erfurt, Jena, Halle, even Magdeburg, already saw the fierce Procopius, and heard the rattlings of his waggons under their walls.[b]

Procopius.

Battle of Aussitz. June 16, 1426.

Shame, indignation, terror, prudence, demanded a better-organised, better-disciplined army, than those which had been hastily raised in different parts of Germany. The banner of the Empire was unfurled. From the Danube and its Hungarian shores up to the Black Forest —from the Alps to the border of Flanders, contingents were required; temporal and spiritual powers, nobles and bishops, knights and burghers, crowded to the Imperial standard; 200,000 men were in arms.[c] A new Order was instituted; the banner bore the Virgin and the Infant Saviour.[d] All this magnificent preparation ended in almost incredible disgrace. The three divisions of the vast army, or rather the three armies, fled without striking a blow, abandoning all their treasures, munitions, carriages, cannon. Henry of Winchester alone, at the head of a band of English crusaders, endeavoured, but in vain, to arrest the utter rout.

July 12 and following days. Great flight, Aug. 4. 1427.

The Crusades against the Hussites had made the Hussites what the Saracens had long been to the Christian world, and they became as Saracens to the whole of Germany. They would no longer wait to be assailed. They

[z] Palacky writes of Procopius:— "Wenn er Ziska in kriegerischer Genialität nicht glick, ihm doch an Geist und politischen Umblick übertraf."—P. 432.

[a] Procopius solemnly declared before the Council of Basle that he had never shed a drop of blood with his own hand. He had commanded in many battles: but Bohemia had been compelled to war by the Pope and the Cardinals: to them belonged all the guilt.

[b] Palacky, p. 414.

[c] Herman Corner, p. 1278.

[d] Raynald. sub ann. 1427. Palacky, p. 439.

assembled on the White Mountain near Prague, 50,000 foot, 20,000 horse, with their impregnable waggons which they built up as a fortress at a few hours' warning, a garrisoned citadel in the enemy's land. On every side they broke out unresisted, except by the stronger cities. Austria, even as far as Hungary, Lausitz, Saxony, were a waste. Leipsic escaped only through her fortifications. Cobourg and Bayreuth were in flames. Nuremberg, Bamberg, closed their gates in terror. The Marquis of Brandenburg, the Bishop of Bamberg, bought their retreat at great cost. Everywhere revenge, religious hatred, fierce fanaticism, marked their way with unspeakable horrors. They thought it but compliance with the Divine command to dispeople the lands of the Philistines, the Edomites, and the Moabites.

Bohemian invasion of Germany.

Sigismund at length attempted milder measures; pacific negotiations began, but the religious question could not be reconciled. The Emperor demanded the unqualified submission of the Bohemians to the decrees of a General Council, to which they were to be admitted in perfect freedom. The Taborites, who might well mistrust, would contract no such obligations. The Orphans, Ziska's section of the milder party, promulgated the new doctrine, that a free people needed no king.

Negotiations.

Nothing remained but a fifth crusade. An army of 100,000 men crossed the Bohemian frontier. In the battle of Taass the Bohemians won a victory no less signal and complete than on former fields. Again the Pope's Legate, the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, alone conducted himself with courage; he was at last constrained to fly; he hardly escaped in the disguise of a common soldier, and left behind him the Papal Bull for the crusade, his cardinal's hat, and his pontifical robes. These trophies remained in the church of Taass for two centuries; the banners were hung in the Tron Church in Prague.[e]

From Aug. 1 to 14.

Battle of Taass, Aug. 14, 1431.

[e] There is a fair general view of these wars in Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund, vol. iii.; but the more full, careful and accurate one from MS. as well as printed authorities in Palacky, Geschichte von Böhmen.

CHAPTER XII.

COUNCIL OF BASLE.

SUCH was the state of the Hussite or Bohemian war on the opening of the Council of Basle under John of Polcmar and John of Ragusa, delegates of the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. On July 23 the Council held its first sitting; in the beginning of August was fought the crowning victory of Procopius, the battle of Taass. Bohemia might seem lost for ever to King Sigismund, to the Pope, to Latin Christianity. The Cardinal himself had witnessed the valour, with difficulty had fled out of the hands, of the unconquerable Taborites. The intelligence of the defeat struck the Council with the utmost consternation; the Fathers began to take even more serious views of the absolute and inevitable necessity of reformation in the Church.[a] A.D. 1431.

Eugenius IV. was obstinately ignorant, imperfectly informed, or contemptuously regardless of the state of affairs beyond the Alps. The calamities which Germany had suffered in this internecine war for nearly fourteen years were beneath the consideration of a Pontiff whose one principle was no peace with heretics. Eugenius had no intention to venture his sacred person beyond the Alps; but a Council not under his own immediate control was a dangerous experiment, which he would if possible avert. Of all things he was affrighted by the manifest determination to enter into peaceful negotiations with the Hussites, with whom he had already declared all treaties null and void, with whom no treaties, on any account, ought to be respected, with whom to negotiate was to suffer a re-

[a] "Quibus auditis, omnibus postpositis, consternati omnes patres de concilio ... recesserunt, multa in animo ruminantes, et nihilominus fortius accensi ad reformationem Ecclesiæ."—John de Ragusio, MS. quoted by Palacky, iii. 3, 6.

hearing of questions already decided at Constance and at Sienna, and to admit the possibility that such heretics might have a good cause. A treaty with heretics, (according to the language of the Pope's Bull) confirmed, as it was said to have been, with mutual oaths, was an insult to God, a blasphemy against the Pope's authority. Without faith salvation was impossible. The Pope therefore abrogated all such treaties, should they exist, in all their articles; he absolved from their oaths princes, prelates, knights, soldiers, magistrates of cities; he commanded them, notwithstanding any such treaty, to rise in a mass, and besiege, slay, exterminate heretics, so that their heresy might perish for ever.[b]

Without delay, without consideration, almost without consultation with the Cardinals, Eugenius issued his Decree, commanding the dissolution of the Council of Basle and the assembly of another after two years at Bologna. The reasons which he deigned to allege were that as yet but few prelates had appeared at Basle; that the roads to Basle were insecure on account of the war between the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria; above all, the greater convenience of the ambassadors from Constantinople. The Byzantine Empire, in its growing agony of dread at the approach of the Turks, had made still more urgent overtures to purchase aid from the West by the submission of the Greek Church to the Pope and to Latin Christianity.

The Legate, Julian Cæsarini, at first so far respected the decree of the Pope that he declined to take his seat as President of the Council. But Cæsarini was a wise and experienced man, he knew well the state of Germany. Even before the arrival of the final Papal mandate for the dissolution, he had addressed a remonstrance, remarkable for its firmness, vigour, dignity; above all, for its weighty and authoritative statement of the sound and just policy of maintaining the Council. "Germany is ready for another campaign in Bohemia; they only await aid and money from Rome. I thought you would have sold your crosses and chalices for such an object. I wait five months; instead of succour I receive an order to dissolve

[b] Raynald. p. 88, sub ann. 1431.

the Council, which is the only hope of union and success." Cæsarini's personal remonstrances to the Pope lest he should stand in the way of the reform of the clergy are most solemn and earnest—"he will be suspected of the grossest hypocrisy as to his own virtue." In his answer to the Bull,[c] the Cardinal Legate almost scornfully disposes of the reasons of the Pope for the prorogation of the Council. "There were few Bishops at the first session, now they are gathering from all quarters. The Emperor has declared the Council under his protection; the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria have suspended their feud, and grant safe conduct to the Holy Fathers. The peace of Germany is not to be sacrificed for the old song, which has rung in the ears of Western Europe for three centuries and ended in nothing, the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches. The Bohemians have been deliberately, formally invited to the Council; arms have been tried in vain; this is the only way in which they can be restored to the Church. What will the heretics say if the Council be dissolved? Will they not, in their insulting and warrantable pride, proclaim that the Church dares not confront them? Will it not be held a confession of weakness? 'Behold, their armies have fled (how often!) from before our face, and now the Catholic Church flies again before us.' Such will be their boast. They are unconquerable in controversy as in war; the hand of God is with them: they hold the truth, we falsehood. Dec. 13, 1431.

"What will the world say? Council after Council and no reformation! The incorrigible clergy will submit to no amendment. The whole laity will fall upon us like the Hussites.[d] Terrible rumours are abroad. Men's minds are in travail; they are ready to vomit forth their deadly venom: they will think it a sacrifice to God if they shall murder or despoil the clergy. The priesthood will become odious to God and man; the slight reverence which now remains will die away. Already Magdeburg has

[c] These two letters are in the Works of Æneas Sylvius, at the close of his Hist. Concil. Basil.

[d] "Propter quod valde timendum est, nisi se emendent ne laici in more Hussitarum in totum clerum irruant ut publice dicunt."—P. 66.

expelled her archbishop and clergy, and is preparing waggons to wage war like the Hussites; it is rumoured that they have sent for a Bohemian general. It is greatly to be feared that Magdeburg is the head of a league among the neighbouring cities. Passau has expelled her Bishop, who was lord of the city; they are even now besieging his castle. In Bamberg there is war between the city and the Bishop and Chapter. Yet not only is the Council to be prorogued to Italy, but to be adjourned for a year and a half. In a year and a half I fear that the whole clergy of Germany will be in a state of ruin. If the news spreads throughout Germany that the Council is dissolved, the whole clergy will be given up to pillage and massacre. 'We shall lose our temporalities.' So said the Jews, 'If we let him go, the Romans will come and take away our place and nation.' And thus say we, 'If we permit the Council to sit, the laity will come and take away our temporalities.' But as by God's justice the Jews, who would not let Christ go, lost their place, so by God's justice if we allow not the Council to sit, we shall lose, not our temporalities only, but our bodies and our souls." The Cardinal ends with earnest supplication that the Pope will at least wait till July, when the heretics were to appear, to frame some canons for the reformation of the German clergy. "If I refuse the Presidency," he concludes, "they will at once proceed to elect their own President."

State of Germany.

Magdeburg, Passau, and Bamberg were not the only cities in which the burghers had risen against their bishops, or were prepared to rise. In Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Erfurt, Spires, Wurtzburg, Strasburg, feuds were raging; the burghers called in the neighbouring princes who were ready to aid them in throwing off the ecclesiastical rule. Was then the crisis so perilous? If the Council of Basle had offered no resistance, and submitted at once to be prorogued to Bologna, is it possible that Germany (worn out by the long war, and exasperated at her own disgrace and misery, of which all would throw the blame on the clergy) might not have disdained to follow the guidance of Bohemia, that the Sela-

vonian might have become a Teutonic movement, and thus a Wycliffite Reformation anticipated by a century that of Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin?

But the Council of Basle now boasted the avowed support of the Emperor and of the Duke of Milan, and scrupled not to send ambassadors to all the other courts of Europe. Their envoys asserted that the Council was lawfully assembled under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost: that all men, even the Roman Pontiff, were bound to render their obedience; that the dissolution of the Council by Eugenius IV. was absolutely null. The Bishop of Novara was sent to Charles King of France; the Bishop of Lodi to Henry of England; the Bishop of Parma to Poland and Prussia; the Abbot of S. Ambrogio in Milan to Alfonso of Arragon; the Abbot of Beauvale to Castile. The Abbot of Clairvaux was to address that great Prince the Duke of Burgundy. Council send ambassadors.

Already the Council began to administer the affairs of Christendom as the great Christian Senate. But at Basle there was a fatal departure from the usage established at Constance. The voting by nations was abrogated, partly, it should seem, in jealousy of the admission of England as the fifth nation:[o] Spain claimed to rank as the fourth. Four deputations were formed. I. Of faith. II. Of pacification. III. Of reformation. IV. Of other matters. Magistrates were appointed to examine and to distribute those who claimed the right of seat and suffrage among these deputations. No dignitary of the Church was rejected who was not a criminal or of evil fame. The result of this was the enormous preponderance of the German and French clergy: being nearer to Basle they poured in with overwhelming numbers. Comparatively few would undertake the long, perilous, and costly journey from Italy, Spain, England, Hungary. The second innovation was even more serious—the annulment of the dominant episcopal authority. The Bishops Right of voting.

[o] There was great strife for precedence between the ambassadors of Spain and England. The Bishop of Parma writes to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order: "Hic fuit magna disceptatio super modo sedendi inter ambasciatores regis Ispaniarum et regis Angliæ; tandem operante Deo, sedata est."—Compare Voigt, Stimmen, p. 64.

lost their prerogative, their influence. Bitter complaints were made that the meanest and most ignorant (the Universities, the Doctors of Canon and Civil Law do not appear prominently), the very dregs and lees of the clergy, carried all questions with a total forfeiture of dignity and utter confusion. It became a fierce democracy.[f]

The Emperor Sigismund, abandoning for the present all hope of reconquering Bohemia, and wisely leaving the negotiations with the Council to work their effect, chose this time for a descent into Italy to receive the Imperial Crown. Philippo Maria Visconti had made magnificent promises of aid. The Duke of Milan now stood almost alone against Florence, Venice, and the Pope. Sigismund came down the Alps with not more than 2000 German and Hungarian horse. Milan welcomed him with a splendid display of feudal honours. He received the Iron Crown of Lombardy from the Archbishop of Milan in the Church of S. Ambrogio. The Duke of Milan alone, notwithstanding his own words, stood aloof in sullen suspicion. He shut himself up in his castle of Abbiate Grosso. He remembered, perhaps, the seizure of his ancestors by the predecessor of Sigismund, the last Emperor who had entered Milan on his descent into Italy.

Sigismund in Italy; A.D. 1431; in Milan;

Sigismund passed onward to the south. If his allies looked on his progress with ungracious and inhospitable coldness, the Guelfic republics hardly abstained from molesting his march; but all parties were exhausted with the wars of the latter years. Sigismund reached Sienna, till then nowhere welcome; he hardly escaped being besieged in Lucca by the Free Companies in the pay of Florence. Sienna received him with some show of joy and pride. His father, Charles IV., had entered Sienna soon after his marriage; the Siennese

in Sienna, July 11, 1432.

[f] "Sic turba inconsulta confusaque, cum docti atque indocti passim admitterentur, tantaque multitudo plebeiæ fæcis implevit synodum ut nulla vox esset, nullaque potestas episcoporum: quia non ratione sed numero vota congregationis æstimabantur."—Æneas Sylvius, Fea, p. 46. In a speech reported in Mansi, p. 231, it is said: "Inter Episcopos ceterosque patres conscriptos vidimus in Basiliâ coquos et stabularios orbis negotia judicantes." This is no doubt aristocratic, probably Italian exaggeration, but it shows the prevailing jealousies.

hailed the Emperor as a fellow-citizen begotten within their walls. At first they were lavish in their contributions, but during eight long months of subtle negotiation with the Pope the weary city was overburthened with his costly and unprofitable maintenance.

And still the Council of Basle, emboldened by the controversy of Cæsarini with the Pope, emboldened by increasing numbers, went on rising in its loftier assumption of authority. The first act was to adopt the extreme assertion of the Council of Constance as to the supremacy of a General Council over the Pope. The doctrine of Gerson and of Hallam found a new, a bold, and an eloquent advocate in Nicolas of Cusa, a man of the most fervent piety and commanding blamelessness of life. The Council constantly received letters of adhesion from Kings, Princes, Bishops, Universities, Cities. The number of Prelates was steadily on the increase; Cardinals, not merely two or three from personal animosity to Eugenius IV., but in considerable numbers, began to fall away from the Pope, to approach, singly and at intervals;[g] though some still hesitated to appear in the Council. The Cardinal of St. Peter, John Cervantes, fled in the disguise of a servant from Amelia. At length not more than four Cardinals remained with the Pope. In vain Eugenius sent forth his inhibitory letters denouncing the Council as the Synagogue of Satan, declaring all excommunicate who went to the Council or aided others in going; that these infected sheep ought to be exterminated; that those would please God who should rise up against, plunder, slay these rebels against the Apostolic See, the fautors of schism, the abettors of division. "It is marvellous but true," that the more Eugenius threatened, the more all flocked to Basle; the inhibition of the Pope had more effect than the summons of the Council.[h] The Council, in this third Session, issued its citation to the Pope and to the Cardinals, and threatened them with further proceedings if they did not appear in three months. In a subse- April 20, 1432.

[g] Voigt, Stimmen.

[h] Æneas Sylvius, Fea. "Nec pauciores, ut mea fert opinio, Eugenii prohibitio viros adduxit, quam vocatio conciliaris." The historian adds: "Quia vetitum quicquid est, magis optamus, insistimusque negatis."—P. 48.

quent Session they declared that in case of the decease of Eugenius IV. the election of the Pope was in the Council. They prepared a Great Seal, they sent the Cardinal of S. Eustachio to take possession of Avignon and the Venaisin. The Pope's four Legates, who appeared with the Archbishops of Tarento and Colocza at their head, were not permitted to assume the Presidency. Their protestations that all which had been done without the Pope's consent was null and void, were treated with contempt. On the Pope was thrown back the guilt of schism. On September 6 the Pope and seventeen Cardinals were proclaimed in contumacy, because they had not appeared, and because they had issued the Bull for the dissolution of the Council.

June 20.

Sigismund was still at Sienna, in a situation at once proud and humiliating;[1] he was formidable, yet, as he described himself, through the treachery of the Duke of Milan, like a wild beast in a cage; a mediator without power to enforce his mediation; courted by all, yet fully obeyed by none; hoping to receive the Imperial crown, yet dependent on extorted or almost eleemosynary contributions for his daily subsistence. The Council looked up to him, yet unjustly mistrusted him. The Pope feared, yet, until the coronation, had him to a certain extent in his power. Sigismund in honour and in interest could not abandon the Council; in honour, for he was a high-minded, generous man, pledged by years of consistent determination to the reform of the Church; in interest, for only through the conciliatory demeanour of the Council to the Bohemians could he regain the crown, which by the inflexible obstinacy of the Pope he must irrecoverably lose. The Pope had endeavoured to extort as the price of Sigismund's coronation (that coronation he could not, he dared not longer refuse) the dissolution of the Council of Basle. The coronation was celebrated at Rome in the spring; but the Emperor would not yield. The Reformation of the Church had been the declared, ostentatious object of his whole reign. All that the Pope could obtain

May 30, 1433.

[1] Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund. The residence of Sigismund at Sienna is minutely detailed in Rascia, Hist. Senen. Muratori, S. R. T. v. xx. p. 48.

was the promised intercession of the Emperor with the Fathers of Basle not to proceed to any harsh decree against the Pope.[k] Sigismund returned over the Alps, he descended towards Basle. The Council, even the Cardinal Julian, would listen to no terms; Sigismund must acquiesce no doubt, with but seeming reluctance.

At length Eugenius IV. was compelled to yield. Already before the Emperor's coronation he had admitted, in a limited way, the legitimacy of the Council. There was still much jealous, ungenerous, dilatory disputation as to the terms in which he should make the concession. But at length, after more than two years' strife and negotiation, the Council of Basle was declared a lawful Œcumenic Council from its commencement.[m] The Bull of Dissolution was absolutely revoked. Sigismund had the satisfaction, before he left Basle,[n] to see the Council established in full authority, and to take his place at its head. Dec. 15, 1433.

Before the Emperor left the Council, he submitted for the consideration of the Fathers the all-important question, the marriage of the clergy. John of Lubeck was to demand in the Emperor's name, in the name of the public morals, the abrogation of their fatal celibacy. John of Lubeck is described as a man of wit, indulging in jests on every occasion. But nothing could be more fearfully serious than the representation on this subject, which John was to lay separately before each deputation, and urge in the strongest manner. After centuries of strife, after all the laws of Hildebrand and his successors, the whole clergy are declared to be living with concubines, in adultery, or worse. They were hated by the whole laity as violating their marriage-beds; confession was become odious. There was strong fear lest the wealth of the clergy should be alienated to their legitimate children; even were it so, better the loss of wealth than of chastity. The Greek

[k] "Ne quid adversus eum durè decernerent."—Æneas Sylv. p. 54.

[m] "Decernimus et declaramus ... Concilium Basiliense a tempore prædictæ inchoationis suæ legitimè continuatum fuisse et esse." The full recognition was no doubt influenced by the insurrection at Romè. See on.

[n] He was at Basle, almost without interruption, from Oct. 11, 1433, to April 12, 1434.

Church admitted marriage. The priests of the Old and New Testaments were married. The greater part of the Council were favourable to the change,[o] except only some of the old, whose days of marriage had gone by, and the Monks, jealous lest the secular Clergy should have privileges denied to themselves. Yet one, a Cardinal, declared in the spirit, almost in the words, of old Paphnutius at Nicea, that though himself aged, he earnestly desired that wives should be *restored* to the Priesthood.[p] The question, as unsuited to the time, was eluded, postponed, dropped.[q]

The Council of Basle had thus obtained an unlimited recognition of its authority, but the Fathers of that Council could not but know that it was an extorted recognition, and that from a most reluctant Pope. For the Council of Basle stood in very different relation to the Pope from those of Pisa or of Constance. Pisa was a Council of Cardinals, driven into revolt by the tergiversations of the two rival Pontiffs; the Italians by the abominable cruelties of Urban VI. As Cardinals, these Prelates assumed at least the lead in the Council; declared their right to depose the two contesting Popes, and to fill the vacancy by a creation of their own. At Constance the Fathers of the Council sat as arbiters between three contending Pontiffs, one of whom, a despised and almost for-

[o] "Res erat complurimis accepta, sed tempori non convenire."

[p] The Cardinal of St. Peter said: "Quamvis senio gravor, neque mentem habeo ad conjugium: sanctum tamen arbitror, uxores *restitui* sacerdotibus: quia non est omnibus gratia Dei concessa, ut legi lumborum resistant ut de Paulo legimus." There is a very curious passage on this subject in the Nemus Unionis of Theodoric à Niem (Tr. vi. c. 35) about the clergy of Norway and Ireland. The Norwegians, both lay and clergy, were great drinkers of ale, and would drink against each other till neither could stand. But in both countries bishops and priests publicly kept their concubines: and when the bishops went on their visitations, the clergy insisted that they should take their own "amasiæ" with them, lest they should be tempted by the superior beauty of those of the clergy: If the clergyman had not a "focaria," he paid double procurations ("ut prævaricator paternarum traditionum, Episcopo visitante proinde procurationes duplices ministrabat"). The wives (?) of the clergy in Ireland took rank: "Ac etiam presbyterorum amasiæ seu uxores in eisdem partibus, statu et gradu in ecclesiâ, in mensis, eundo, sedendo, et stando, cæteris dominabus *etiam militaribus* proponuntur." The same marriage or concubinage, with the advancement of the children (ex fœdo complexu nati) to benefices, prevailed in Germany, Spain, and Portugal. It must be remembered that this is from Theodoric à Niem. I shall hereafter refer to unanswerable evidence on this repulsive subject from records of Visitations.

[q] "Vicit tamen sententia illorum qui *hoc tempore* tantum opus aggrediendum negavere." See the whole very curious passage in Æneas Sylvius, Fea, p. 55.

gotten exile, had with difficulty found refuge in his native land of Venice; one was shut up in a fortress in Spain; one had rashly delivered himself, bound hand and foot by the crimes of his former life, into their hands. He had tried, but in vain, to break his bonds; he was abandoned by all Christendom. No sooner was there a Pope, Martin V., than he was acknowledged by the Council and by the whole West. He resumed at once the full supremacy over the Church. But the Council of Basle, if summoned by a Pope, and duly convened according to the decrees of former Councils, sat on one side of the Alps, and the Pope on the other; neither had any force to compel submission to its decrees. Eugenius IV. had so far been in uncontested possession of Rome and of the throne of St. Peter; if embroiled in Italian politics, with no apprehension that either the Italian potentates or the Italian clergy, still less that any formidable majority among the Cardinals, would take the part of the Council against the Pope.

A sudden insurrection had compelled Eugenius to fly in a mean disguise from Rome. The Romans had thrown his nephew, the Cardinal of Venice, into prison, chosen a Senate, installed magistrates. They sent an embassy to Basle to arraign Eugenius; "they had cast out the proud Tarquin." [q] Rome, in their language, was a city of Bruti, Scævolæ, Horatii, Catones.[r] The Pope was received in Guelfic Florence. The Patriarch of Alexandria, John Vitelleschi, a ferocious and able Condottier (he had already hanged the famous Antonio of Pisa for violating the Papal territory), appeared with his terrible troops under the walls of Rome. Not a Brutus nor a Cato would lay down his life. The people submitted ignominiously to return to their allegiance. But the Pope, as a punishment for their unruliness, or in mistrust, now honoured Bologna as his residence.[s] Behind the strong walls of Bologna, secure in the succour of Venice and of Florence, he was beyond the reach of the intrigue or violence of his deadly enemy, Philippo Visconti of Milan; and he might watch

May 15, 1434.

Oct. 26, 1434.

April 18, 1436.

[r] This may be the classic irony of Æneas Sylvius, p. 61.

[s] Muratori, sub ann. 1436. Till this time he had remained in Florence.

with serene composure the proceedings at Basle, ready to seize every opportunity of advantage or of revenge.

The Council of Basle, on the other hand, might as yet pursue its deliberations in dignified security, but no more. There was no great monarch to espouse their cause or give weight to their decrees. The Emperor Sigismund's final act of imposing power was his appearance in the Council. The two last years of his reign were more than inglorious, ignominious. He was succeeded for two disturbed years by his son Albert. Frederic III., the new Emperor elected on the death of Albert, surrendered himself to the treacherous guidance of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, at first the bold asserter of ecclesiastical freedom in the Council, then skilfully preparing his own way, first to Bishoprics, Cardinalates, finally to the Popedom, by calming down Germany to an undignified neutrality. Charles VII. governed hardly half of France. The King of England for the time ruled in Paris, and that king was the feeble, devout Henry VI. The only sovereign who seemed to take much interest in the proceedings of the Council was Alfonso of Castile, in virtue of his Sicilian or Neapolitan connexions.

Feb. 2, 1440.

Thus, then, the Pope and Council sat at first in disguised, before long in open, oppugnancy, but their hostility was confined to Declarations and Acts which neither could maintain but by words. Each asserted his prerogative to the utmost; the Council its own supremacy over all Christendom, including the Pope — its function was to reform the Church in its head and in its members; the Pope averred that the Council sat only by his permission, derived from him its limited authority, was guilty of ecclesiastical treason by any invasion of the all-comprehending Papal supremacy.

If the Council of Basle was wanting in the presence or the support of the great royal powers, as an Ecclesiastical Senate it was august enough. Though the most learned Fathers of Constance had passed away—D'Ailly, Gerson, Zabarella, the Cardinal of St. Mark, Hallam—it boasted representatives of the Church from almost every quarter of Christendom. Among these was the Cardinal

Louis, Archbishop of Arles, the President after the secession of the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini to Ferrara. His lofty independence and resistance to the Papal See did not prevent his subsequent canonisation.[t] Among the Prelates from Spain was the Archbishop of Palermo. From France came Thomas de Corcelles; from Deventer in Holland, Nicolas de Cusa, whose fame stood almost the highest among the theologians of the day. Nicolas de Cusa, a conscientious zealot for the reform of the Clergy, was afterwards decoyed from the Council by the adroit flattery of Pope Eugenius. "His peerless learning was absolutely necessary to conduct the negotiations with the Greek Church, now returning into the bosom of Rome." He went to Florence; and once within the magic circle, he left not the Papal Court during the sittings of the Council.[u] Last and most important was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, an Italian, the most elegant writer of Latin, the historian of the Council—at one time its ruling authority, at another its most dangerous, because secret, foe.

The Council of Basle stood firm on the unshaken ground of the established theology; not a whisper of suspicion attainted the doctrinal orthodoxy of its Fathers. The concessions to the Bohemian insurgents were avowedly extorted in order to save Germany from their inroads. It was a far-sighted policy, a policy conducted by the Fathers of Basle (especially the President, Cardinal Cæsarini) with dignity and moderation which might command the admiration and gratitude of Christendom. According to the compact of Eger the ambassadors of Bohemia appeared at Basle. The theological questions arising out of the four Articles of Prague were discussed on the whole with singular sedateness, and with an earnest, almost an affectionate desire for union. On the side of the Bohemians stood Rokyçana, now the acknowledged head of the Utraquists; Peter Payne, the Englishman; the Priest-warrior Procopius, as ready in

A.D. 1433.

[t] Æneas Sylvius describes Louis as "homo multarum parabolarum, liberalitate insignis, sed odio erga Eugenium veteri et novo accendissimus."—P. 67.

[u] I have read a prolix and laborious life of Nicolas of Cusa by G. M. Dax, Regensburg, 1847.

theological dispute as in battle; on the other the most learned theologians of France, Germany, some of Italy. Julian Cæsarini presided with gentle dignity. The occasional outbursts of irresistible scorn and oppugnancy were repressed by common consent.[x] The concession of Communion in both kinds seemed determined, at least to a certain extent. The other Articles were eluded or compromised.

But these concessions, and the long-protracted negotiations which ensued, were fatal to the unity, and so to the strength of Bohemia. Dissensions arose: they could not but arise. The concessions were ambiguous, variously interpreted, received with eagerness, rejected with passion. The dragon's teeth were sown, the armed men sprang up. Nobles and Burghers, Utraquists and Taborites, were in open, deadly feud, or in secret counter-working hostility. The war, never entirely dis-
May 30, 1434. continued, broke out again. The disastrous battle of Lepan broke for ever the spell of Bohemian invincibility. Procopius the Great fell in the field; with Procopius fell the military glory, the religious inflexibility of Bohemia. After some time Sigismund (he still
Aug. 24, 1436. lived) ascended the throne; he was received in Prague. Rokyçana was permitted to accept the barren dignity of Archbishop of Prague. The able Philip, Bishop of Coutances, then Legate of the Council of Basle, exercised the real ecclesiastical authority. On Sigismund's death, the crown of Bohemia was the object of a fierce contest between his son, the Austrian Albert, and Casimir of Poland. But it was a strife of Sclavonian and German. The religious interest, the religious passions, were well-nigh burnt out. Tabor, Sion, were besieged and fell. The great Sclavonian Reformation was at an end; it lived only in its impulses, its glorious reminiscences, its opinions, the clang of its debates, which still rang in the European mind; hereafter disembarrassed of some of its wilder tenets, to wake to final victory in the more sober, stedfast, reflective Teutonic mind. The Council of Basle had perhaps averted doctrinal reformation for above a century.

The ostensible and paramount purpose of the Council of

[x] Palacky, iii. 3, ch. ii.

Basle was the Reform of the Clergy. From all quarters the solemn admonitions, the grave expostulations of the more devout and rigid, the bitter satire of the wits of the day, the denunciations of the enemies of the Clergy had been deepening since the Council of Constance had eluded this perilous question. Still there was no thought of a religious revolution; a revolution, in modern phrase strictly conservative, was its utmost thought. Its highest aim was to reduce the arbitrary autocracy of the Pope to a constitutional monarchy, in order to strengthen not to overthrow that monarchy. The Pope was to take a solemn oath on his inauguration to respect certain rights and liberties of the Church: the College of Cardinals was to be restricted to a certain number, but they were to be the standing Council, in some degree an authoritative Council, to the Pope; the Senate of the Church. On the other hand, against the concubinage of the Clergy the Council were now as rigid as Gregory or Innocent. For the first conviction the offender incurred deprivation of all emoluments for three months; for obstinate disobedience, degradation.

Yet the reform of the hierarchy must begin with the Head. The immoderate taxation of the Roman Court; the Annates and other charges; the usurpations of the Popes as to the promotions to the richer benefices, lay at the root of many of the abuses. The axe must strike boldly and relentlessly at the heart of the evil. Here began the open, obstinate, irreconcileable collision. The Council on these points would not yield, the Pope would not for a moment relax his grasp. Against each usurpation, as he declared it, on the inextinguishable rights of the successors of St. Peter, so soon as the decree reached him he protested with the most uncompromising haughtiness. Papal power had never been advanced in more undisguised or peremptory language. In the Pope was the absolute right of conferring all benefices; from him emanated all spiritual power: he was the Bishop of Bishops, the sole fountain, the arbiter, the dispenser, the distributer of ecclesiastical authority. So was war fully declared between the Pope and the Council; their utterly irreconcileable pretensions had come into direct conflict. The Council would limit the Pope; the Pope would endure no limitation.

CHAPTER XIII.

COUNCIL OF FERRARA. THE GREEKS.

The Pope had appealed to Christendom on his original inherent irresponsible autocracy, even before the affair of the reconciliation of the Greek Church becoming more urgent gave him a special pretext for convoking the Council to some city of Italy. This act was in truth the dissolution of the Council of Basle. For the Teutonic Council of Basle with all its aspirations after freedom, the substitution of an Italian Council, if not servilely submissive, in interests and views closely bound up with the Pope, had been from the first the declared policy of Eugenius IV. And now the union of the Churches of the East and West, so long delayed, so often interrupted, might seem an inevitable necessity; it was imminent, immediate, at the will and the command of the West, which might dictate its own terms. The Emperor, and even the Patriarch of Constantinople seemed driven, in their deathpang of terror at the approach of the victorious Turks, to accept the aid of the West at any cost, at any sacrifice. The Emperor John Palæologus was hardly master of more than the Imperial city. Constantinople was nearly the whole Byzantine Empire.

Reconciliation of Eastern Empire.

Nothing, however, shows more clearly that the Council and the Pope divided the allegiance of Christendom than that ambassadors from the Eastern Empire appeared in Basle as well as in Rome. Negotiations were conducted between the Emperor and Patriarch as well with the Council as with the Pope.[a] Legates from

[a] Syropulus (p. 17), the Greek, describes the Council as assembled to remedy the monstrous evils which had grown up in the West, and for the limitation of the Pope's power, and that of his court: ἐπὶ διορθώσει τῶν ἀτόπων τῶν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἰταλίας παρεμφθαρέντων, καὶ μαλίστα ἐπὶ τῇ συστολῇ καὶ ὑποστυπώσει τοῦ Παπα καὶ τῆς κύρτης αὐτοῦ. Of the three ambassadors to Basle, two were Demetrius, the great Stratopedarch, and Isidore, afterwards Metropolitan of Russia. See the account of their reception—Syropulus, p. 23, *et seqq.*

the Council as from the Pope were sent to Constantinople. Contracts were entered into for galleys, if not hired, promised both by Pope and Council to convey the Byzantine and his Clergy to the West. The crafty Greeks seemed disposed to bargain with the highest bidder, and with him who could give best security. The difficulties and advantages seemed singularly balanced. The Pope might admit the Easterns to unity, but Transalpine Christendom alone could pay the price of their laudable apostasy. Effective aid could be expected not from Italy, but from the Emperor (Sigismund was still on the throne) and from a crusade of all Europe. If the Greeks were unwilling to appear at Basle, the Council would consent to adjourn for this purpose to Avignon. And Avignon, it was thought, would purchase the high honour of becoming the seat of the Council for this glorious object, at the price of 70,000 pieces of gold for the convoy of the Emperor and his retinue. Avignon declined, or at least was not prompt in the acceptance of these terms. Negotiations with Pope and Council.

The Pope during the preceding year had offered the choice of the great cities of Italy—Bologna, Ancona, Ravenna, Florence, Pisa, Mantua, even Rome. He now insisted on the alternative of Florence or of Udine in the Friulian province of his native Venice. Florence, his faithful ally, would open her own gates, Venice would admit a Council into her territory, not within her lagunes. If the reconciliation of the Greek and the Latin Church, the tardy and compulsory submission of Constantinople to the See of Rome, had been the one paramount, transcendant duty of Christendom: if it was to swallow up and supersede all the long agitated questions of the reform in the hierarchy, the reinstatement of the sacerdotal Order not only in its power but in its commanding holiness, the Pope might urge strong reasons for the transplantation of the Council to Italy. The Greeks might well be alarmed at the unnecessary difficulties of a journey over the snowy Alps, the perils of wild roads, of robber chieftains. The Pope felt his strength in resting the dispute on that issue alone. At all events it might create a schism at Basle. The Transalpine party still adhered to Avignon, or some

city of France. But if the Greeks also were to be considered, there could be no doubt of the superior convenience of Italy.[b]

March 3, 1437. The Papal Legate, the Archbishop of Tarento, appeared at Basle to propose the removal of the Council for this great end to Florence or to Udine. The President of the Council was still the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. Up to this time Cæsarini had stood firm and unshaken on the rights of the Council, but now with other Italian Prelates inclined towards obedience to the Pope. But the large number of the Transalpine Clergy, especially of the lower clergy, knew that once evoked to Italy the Council, as an independent assembly, was at an end. The debate was long and turbulent. They came to the vote. Above two-thirds of the Council rejected the prorogation to Florence or Udine. The Duke of Milan, still opposed to the Pope in Italian politics, on his part desirous of having the Council in his dominions, offered a third alternative, the city of Pavia. Æneas Sylvius, in an eloquent speech of two hours (it was a convenient resting-place for Æneas ere he passed from the interests of the Council to that of the Pope) urged this middle course. He wrought on the ambassadors of Castile, but the Council was obdurate; it would not pass the Alps. The decree of the majority was publicly read, ordered to be engrossed, and confirmed with the seal of the Council. To the indignation of most, a Bishop arose and published aloud the decree of the minority as that of the Council.[c] Nor was this all; at night the Bull of the Council was stolen from its box, the silken thread which attached the seal had been cut, the seal appended to the substituted decree of the Papal party. The fraud was openly charged, it was believed to be brought home to the Legate, the Archbishop of Tarento. His officer was treated with contumely, even with personal violence. The Archbishop with inconceivable effrontery avowed and gloried in the crime. He had advised, ordered,

[b] On one occasion the Patriarch said with simplicity that he had no inclination to be food for fishes: ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ ἄξιον κρίνετε φείδεσθαι ἐμαυτοῦ, μήποτε καὶ ἐν τῷ πελάγει ῥιφεὶς καταβρωμα γένωμαι τῶν ἰχθύων. — Syropulus, p. 22. The magniloquent Latin translator makes the fishes whales.

[c] Æneas Sylvius, p. 73. L'Enfant, i. p. 481, &c.

aided in the theft. He had done it, and would do it were it to do again. Must he not obey the Apostolic See rather than a rabble?[d] He fled from the city (he was threatened with imprisonment) under an armed escort. The Emperor heard of this unworthy artifice; he declared that the crime should not pass unpunished. Europe rang with the guilt of the Legate. July 5, 1437.

Eugenius loudly protested against this insolent impeachment of his Legate. He denounced the violence threatened against his sacred person, the rude usage of the Archbishop's officer: he afterwards rewarded the Archbishop with the Cardinalate. His protest and denunciations were heard with incredulity or indifference at Basle.

The Pope was more successful in his dealings at Constantinople. The Assembly, he urged, was but a small knot of unruly spirits, usurping the name of a Council; their sole object was to diminish the power of the Pope, the Pope who alone had the right to summon a Council and control their proceedings. He warned the Byzantines against trusting to their promises; they had no money to transport the Greeks to the West, none for ulterior purposes. Venice had already prepared her galleys for the convoy of the Emperor. Of Venice the Greeks well knew the power and the wealth. Yet the crafty Greeks might well smile at the zeal of the Pope for the unity of the Church, which made him hold up their reconciliation as the one great object of Christendom, while in the West the unity was thus broken by the feud of Pope and Council.

That feud was growing more violent and irreconcileable. The Council issued their monition to the Pope and to the Cardinals to appear before them at Basle within sixty days, and answer for their acts. They annulled his creation of Cardinals. At the expiration of the sixty days they solemnly declared the Pope contumacious. He had promulgated his Bull for July 31. Sept. 26. Oct. 31.

[d] "Tarentinus alti cordis vir, intrepidus, audax. Quid vos, inquit, tantopere factum vituperatis? Rectum est et laude dignum, quod reprehenditur. Suasi ego rem, fieri mandavi, operam dedi, et nisi fecissem, hodie facerem. Apostolicæ Sedi magis quam vestræ turbæ obnoxius sum. Verum ego decretum plumbavi, vos adulterinum. Vi nos impediistis plumbare: cur arte non vindicabimus, quod nobis vi rapitur? nolo negare quod feci et recte feci."—Æn. Sylvius, p. 74.

the Council of Ferrara. That Bull they declared void and of none effect. After some delay they proceeded to the suspension of the Pope. Other resolutions passed, limiting appeals to the Roman See, abolishing expectatives, gradually unfolding and expanding their views of Church Reformation.

Jan. 24, 1435.

The union of the Greek and Latin Churches, as it was understood in the West by the Pope and the high Papalists, the unqualified subjection of the East to the successor of St. Peter, by the Council the subjection to the Western Church represented at Basle, seemed to acquire more paramount importance from the eager and emulous exertions of the Council and the Pope to secure each to itself the Imperial proselyte. The Emperor, John VI. Palæologus, might at first appear to balance with lofty indifference their conflicting claims; to weigh the amount and the certainty of their offers, in which they vied against each other; and to debate which would be the most serviceable ally against the terrible Ottoman, and therefore best reward the sacrifice of the religious freedom of the East. Those were not wanting who advised him to dismiss the ambassadors of both, and declare, "when you have settled your own quarrels[e] it will be time for us to discuss the terms of union." Friar John, the Legate of the Council, as he began to despair of conducting the Emperor to Basle, would at all hazards keep him away from Italy. He urged this dignified course; the more important adviser, the Emperor Sigismund, gave the same counsel.[f] But the Byzantine was now resolutely, as far as a mind so feeble was capable of resolution, determined on his journey to the West. He could not hope to hold a Council in Constantinople, in which the West would be but partially represented, if it condescended to be represented; or in which his own Church, dominant in numbers, if required to make the slightest concession, would render obedience. His fears and his vanity had wrought him to desperate courage. He could not but know that the Turks were still closing round

The Emperor John Palæologus.

[e] Laonicus Chalcondylas. By a great anachronism he antedates the election of the Antipope Felix by the Council at Basle, and makes it a contest between the rival Pontiffs.—lvi. p. 287. Edit. Bonn.

[f] Syropulus, p. 57.

his narrowing empire, though there was for the moment some delay or suspense in their movements. Amurath had hardly consented to a hollow and treacherous delay,[g] and who could know when they might be under the walls of Constantinople? Yet had he strange notions of his own grandeur. The West would lay itself at his feet; he might be chosen the successor of Sigismund, and reunite the great Christian commonwealth under one sovereign.[i]

But he had great difficulty in persuading the heads of his Church to embark on a perilous voyage to a distant and foreign Council, where their few voices might be overborne by multitudes.[k] Joseph the Patriarch was old, infirm, of feeble character: he yielded with ungracious reluctance,[k] but scrupled not to compel the attendance of his more prudent and far-sighted clergy. They too found consolation to their vanity, food for their ambition. "The barbarous and ignorant West would bow before the learning and profound theology of the successors of Basil, the Gregories, and Chrysostom." Nor were they without some vague notions of the prodigal and overflowing wealth of the West: they would return having achieved a victory by their irresistible arguments, and at the same time with money enough to pay their debts.[m] If the Latins should stand aloof in sullen obstinacy, they would return with the pride of having irradiated Italy with the truth, and of having maintained in the face of Rome the cause of orthodoxy; at the worst, they could but die as glorious martyrs for that truth.[n] The Patriarch laboured under still more extravagant illusions. "When the Eastern Emperor should behold the pomp of the Pope, the lowly deference paid to their ecclesiastical superiors by the great potentates of the West, he would take lessons of humility, and no longer mistake the relative dignity of the spiritual and

[g] The treaty in Phranza, p. 118.

[i] Syropulus, p. 36.

[k] See his speech (Syropulus, p. 16) in the time of Pope Martin, in which he predicts the inevitable humiliation from attending a Council in Italy, at the expense of the Westerns. Ἐν γοῦν τῷ ἀσιλθεῖν οὕτω καὶ ἐκδίχεσθαι καὶ τὴν ἡμερησίαν τροφὴν ἐξ ἐκείνων, ἤδη γίνονται δοῦλοι καὶ μισθωταὶ, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ κύριοι.

[m] Syropulus, p. 63, 3. Καὶ ἀσιλευσόμεθα καὶ ὑποστρέψομεν νικηταὶ τροπαιοῦχοι.

[n] Syropulus, ibid.

temporal Sovereign.[o] These strange and chimerical hopes blinded some at least to the danger of their acts, and even mitigated for a time their inextinguishable hatred of the Latins; for the Latin conquest of Constantinople still left its deep indelible animosity in the hearts of the Greek Churchmen. They had been thrust from their Sees; Latin Bishops speaking a foreign tongue had been forced upon their flocks; they had been stripped of their revenues, reduced to poverty and contempt. On the reconquest of Constantinople, the Cantacuzenes and Palæologi had resumed the full temporal sovereignty, but the Church had recovered only a portion of its influence, wealth, and power. Even in Constantinople, still more in many cities of the Empire, the Latin Bishops still claimed a co-ordinate authority, refused to be deposed, and, where the Franks were in force, maintained their thrones. There were at least titular Latin Bishops of most of the great Eastern Sees.

Emperor accepts the offer of Rome.

The Emperor and the Patriarch determined to accept the invitation of the Pope, and to reject that of the Council. Vague and terrible notions of the danger of surmounting the Alps, or of the interminable voyage to Marseilles, if Avignon should be the seat of the Council; the more doubtful, less profuse promises of money for the voyage from the Council; the greater dexterity and address of the Papal Legate, wrought powerfully on their minds. The fatal and insulting declaration of the Council—"They had subdued the new heresy of the Bohemians, they should easily subdue the old heresy of the Greeks"[p]—had been industriously reported, and could not be forgiven. More politic Rome made no such mistake: her haughtiness could wait its time, could reserve itself in bland courteousness till the adversary was in her power, at her feet.

Rival fleets.

Eight Papal galleys, furnished in Venice and in Crete, entered the harbour of Constantinople. They had not long arrived when it was heard that the fleet of the Council was drawing near. The Council had

[o] Syropulus, p. 92. Καὶ διὰ τοῦ πάπα λίως.—κ. τ. λ. ἐθάῤῥει ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν ἐκκλησιάν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιθείσης αὐτοῦ δουλείας παρὰ τοῦ βασι-

[p] Syropulus, p. 27.

at length prevailed on the city of Avignon to furnish the necessary funds; the ships had been hired and manned at Marseilles. The Roman Admiral, the Pope's nephew Condolmieri, produced his commission to burn, sink, or destroy the hostile fleet. He gave orders to his squadron to set sail and encounter the insolent enemy.[q] It was with great difficulty that the Emperor prevented a battle between the fleets of the Pope and of the Council: an edifying proof to the Turks, who occupied part of the shores, of the unity of Christendom!—to the Greeks a significant but disregarded warning, as to the advantages which they might expect from their concessions to Western Christendom, itself in such a state of fatal disunion!

After nearly three months' delay—delay afterwards bitterly reproached by the Pope against the Greeks, as having involved much loss of time and needless expense—the Emperor and the Patriarch embarked on board the Venetian galleys. The Emperor was accompanied by his brother, the Despot Demetrius, whom it might be dangerous to leave behind in Constantinople; and attended by a Court, the magnificence of whose titles might make up for their moderate numbers. The Church made even a more imposing display. The Patriarch was encircled by the Bishops of the most famous Sees in the East, some of them men of real distinction. There were those who either held or were supposed to be the representatives of the three Patriarchates now under Moslem dominion—Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem; the Primate of Russia, whose wealth excited the wonder and envy of the Greeks; Bessarion Archbishop of Nicea, and Mark of Ephesus, the two most renowned for their learning; the Prelates of Cyzicum, Heraclea, Nicomedia, Trebizond, Lacedæmon, and other famous names. The greater monasteries were represented by some of their Archimandrites. The Patriarch was attended, in his person, by all the high officers and the inferior dignitaries of S. Sophia, the cross-bearers, the whole choir of singers, the treasurer, the guardian of the

[q] μόλις οὖν διὰ πολλῶν λόγων καὶ μηνυμάτων κατέπεισε τὸν καντελουμέρην, καὶ ἠσύχασε.—Syropulus, p. 55. The Papal Legates had persuaded the Greeks that the Council of Basle was dissolved.

books, the guardian of the vestments, the guardian of those who claimed the right of asylum, the expounder of the Canon Law, and Syropulus, the Ecclesiast or the Preacher. The last avenged the compulsion laid upon him to follow his master to Ferrara and Florence by writing a lively and bold history of the whole proceedings.[r] The preparations, both of the Emperor and the Patriarch, made an incongruous display of pomp and poverty. The Emperor, that he might appear as the magnificent Sovereign of the East, to the indignation of the Church appropriated and lavished the sacred treasures, which had been sent as votive offerings by rich worshippers, on his own adornments, on a golden chariot, and cloth of gold for his bed. It was proposed that the Patriarch alone should appear in becoming state; the Bishops without their useless copes and Dalmatics, in the coarse dress and cowls of simple monks. It was answered that the haughty Latins would scoff at their indigence. Notwithstanding the prodigies which remonstrated against their removal, the sacred vessels of S. Sophia were borne off, that the Patriarch might everywhere be able to celebrate Mass in unpolluted patins and chalices, and without being exposed to the contemptuous toleration of the Latins. When, however, on the division of the first Papal subsidy (15,000 florins), the Emperor assigned only the sum of 6000 to the clergy, the Patriarch resolutely declared that he would not proceed to the Council. The Emperor was no less stubborn: he gave the Patriarch 1000 for his own use, and distributed the 5000 among the clergy; to the richer less, to the poor more.[s]

The voyage.

An earthquake (dire omen!) shook the city as they set sail. The voyage was long, seventy-seven days. The timid landsman, the Ecclesiast, may have exaggerated its discomforts and perils. It was humiliating alike to the Emperor and to the Patriarch. As they passed Gallipoli they were saluted with showers of javelins from the Turkish forts. In another place, though there was no declared war, the Hagarenes would scarcely allow

[r] This remarkable work of Syropulus is the chief and trustworthy authority for the voyage, personal adventures, and personal feelings of the Greeks.

[s] Syropulus, 63.

them to take in water. The Emperor hardly escaped falling into the hands of some Catalan pirates. The Patriarch, when he landed, had to endure the parsimonious courtesy and the niggard hospitality of the Latin Prelates who occupied Greek Sees on the coast.[t]

Nothing, however, could equal the magnificence of their reception at Venice. The pride of the Republic was roused to honour, no doubt to dazzle, so distinguished a guest. As they approached the Lagunes, the Doge rowed forth in the Bucentaur, with twelve other galleys, the mariners in silken dresses, the awnings and flags of silk, the emblazoned banners of St. Mark waving gorgeously above. The sea was absolutely covered with gondolas and galleys. "You might as well number the leaves of the trees, the sands of the sea, or the drops of rain." The amazement of the Greeks at the splendour, wealth, and populousness of Venice forcibly shows how Constantinople had fallen from her Imperial state:—"Venice the wonderful—most wonderful! Venice the wise—most wise! The city foreshown in the Psalm, 'God has founded her upon the waters.'"[u] Arrival at Venice.

The respectful homage of the Doge to the Emperor was construed by the Greeks into adoration.[x] He was conducted (all the bells of the city loudly pealing, and music everywhere sounding) up to the Rialto. There he was lodged in a noble and spacious palace; the Patriarch in the monastery of St. George. The Patriarch visited the Church of St. Mark. The Greeks gazed in utter astonishment at the walls and ceilings glittering with mosaics of gold and precious stones, and the carvings in precious woods. The great treasure, shown only twice a-year, flew open before them: they beheld the vast and incalculable mass of gold and jewels, wrought with consummate art, and set in the most exquisite forms; but amid their amazement rose the bitter thought, "These were once our own:

[t] See the voyage in Syropulus at length, with many amusing incidents by land and sea, 69, *et seqq.* Gibbon justly says that "the historian has the uncommon talent of placing each scene before the reader's eye."—Note c. lxvi. p. 99.

[u] Phranza, ii. 15, p. 181, 6. Edit. Bonn.

[x] Phranza says, προσεκύνησε τὸν βασίλεα καθήμενον.

they are the plunder of our Santa Sophia, and of our holy monasteries." [y]

The Doge gave counsel to the Emperor—wise Venetian counsel, but not quite in accordance with the close alliance of Venice with the Pope, or her respect for her mitred son, Eugenius IV.[z] He might take up his abode in Venice, duly balance the offers of the Pope and the Council of Basle, and accept the terms most advantageous to himself or his Empire.

If the Emperor hesitated, he was determined by the arrival of Cardinal Cæsarini, deputed by the Pope, with the Marquis of Este, to press his immediate presence at Ferrara. Julian Cæsarini had now abandoned the Council of Basle: his desertion to the hostile camp might indicate that their cause was sinking towards desperation. He was now the Legate of the Pope, not that of the majority, it might be, but dwindling, more democratic, almost discomfited, majority at Basle.[a]

Early in March the Emperor set forward to Ferrara. He travelled (it was so arranged) partly by water, partly by land, with greater speed than the aged Patriarch, who was highly indignant, as the Church ought to have taken precedence. In the reception of the Emperor at Ferrara all was smooth courtesy. He rode a magnificent black charger; another of pure white, with trappings emblazoned with golden eagles, was led

The Emperor at Ferrara.

[y] Syropulus. There was one splendid image wrought entirely out of the gold and jewels taken in Constantinople: τοῖς μὲν κεκτημένοις κακύχημα καὶ τέρψις ἐγένετο καὶ ἡδονή, τοῖς δ' ἀφαιρεθεῖσιν εἰ τοῦ καὶ παρατυχοιεν, ἀθύμια καὶ λύπη καὶ κατήφια, ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν τότε συνέβη. Syropulus is better authority than Ducas, and would hardly have suppressed, if he had witnessed the wonder of the Venetians at the celebration of the Mass by the Greeks according to their own rite. "'Verily,'" writes Ducas, "they exclaimed in wonder, 'these are the first-born of the Church, and the Holy Ghost speaks in them.'"—Ducas, c. xxxi.

[z] Syropulus, p. 85.

[a] There is however considerable difficulty, and there are conflicting authorities as to the time, at which Julian Cæsarini, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, left Basle (see Fea's note to Æneas Sylvius, p. 128); and also whether, as Sanuto asserts, he appeared before the Emperor of the East, not as representative of the Pope, but of the Council. Cæsarini seems to have been in a state of embarrassment: he attempted to mediate between the more violent and the papalising parties at Basle. He lingered for some months in this doubtful state. Though accredited by the Pope at Venice, he may have given himself out as representing the sounder, though smaller part of the Council of Basle. This was evidently the tone of the Eugenians.

before him. The Princes of Este bore the canopy over his head. He rode into the courts of the Papal palace, dismounted at the staircase, was welcomed at the door of the chamber by the Pope. He was not permitted to kneel, but saluted with a holy kiss, and took his seat at the Pope's right hand. The attendants had indeed taken up the hem of the Pope's garment, and exposed his foot, but of this the Greeks took no notice. The Patriarch moved more slowly: his barge was splendidly adorned,[b] but there ended his idle honours. He had still cherished the fond hope that the Pope would receive him as his equal. He had often boasted that the Patriarchate would now be delivered from its base subjection to the Empire. He was met by a messenger with the tidings that the Pope expected him to kneel in adoration and kiss his foot. This degrading ceremony his own Bishops had declined.[c] "If he is the successor of St. Peter," said the Patriarch in his bitterness, "so are we of the other Apostles. Did they kiss St. Peter's feet?" No Cardinals came out to meet him, only six Bishops, at the bridge. His own Bishops, who were with him, reproached the Patriarch: "Are these the honours with which you assured us we were to be received?" The Patriarch threatened to return home. The Pope, disappointed in the public humiliation of the Patriarch at his feet, would grant only a private audience. In the morning they all mounted horses furnished by the Marquis of Este, and rode to the gates of the Papal palace. All but the Patriarch alighted. He rode through the courts to the foot of the staircase. They passed through a suite of chambers, through an array of attendants with silver wands of office. The doors closed behind them. They were admitted only six at a time to the presence of the Pope. Eugenius was seated with only his Cardinals around. He welcomed the Patriarch with a brotherly salute. The Patriarch took his seat somewhat lower, on a level with the Cardinals. His cross-bearers did not accompany him: they came last, and were permitted to kiss the hand and the cheek of the Pope. Now

March 4.

March 8.

[b] Phranza compares it to Noah's Ark. He was astonished with its sumptuousness and accommodation.—P. 189.

[c] Syropulus, p. 95.

as afterwards, in their more private intercourse, the Pope and the Patriarch being ignorant, the one of Greek, the other of Latin, discoursed through an interpreter.[d]

Discontent of the Greeks.

The Greeks had not been many days at Ferrara, ere they began to suspect that the great object of the Pope was his own aggrandisement, the strengthening of his power against the Council of Basle. They looked with jealousy on every artful attempt to degrade their Patriarch from his absolute coequality with the Pope, on his lower seat, and the limitation of the honours paid to him; they reproached the Patriarch with every seeming concession to the Papal pride.[e] Before they met in the Council, they had the prudence curiously to inspect the arrangements in the great church. They found a lofty and sumptuous throne raised for the Pope in the midst: the rest were to sit, as it were, at his feet. Even the Emperor was roused to indignation. After much dispute it was agreed that the Pope should occupy a central throne, but slightly elevated. On his right, was a vacant chair for the Emperor of the West, then the Cardinals and dignitaries of the Latin Church; on his left, the seat of the Eastern Emperor, followed by the Patriarch and the Greek clergy. But the affairs dragged languidly on. The Pope affected to expect the submission of the Fathers of Basle. The Italian Prelates were by no means imposing in numbers; of the other Latin clergy were very few. The only ambassadors, those of the Duke of Burgundy. The Greeks perhaps knew not in what terms the Western clergy had been summoned. "If the Latins had any parental love they would hasten to welcome the prodigal son: the Greek Church returning to his father's home." The appeal to the charity of the Latins had no great result. The Patriarch had joined with the Pope at the first Session in an anathema, if they should contumaciously remain aloof from this Council. Awe was as powerless as love.

The Emperor retired to a monastery about six miles from Ferrara, and abandoned himself to the pleasures of

[d] Syropulus, p. 96.

[e] The Bishop of Trebisond was usually the spokesman.—Syropulus, p. 160.

the chase. The husbandmen in vain remonstrated against his wanton destruction of their crops, the Marquis of Ferrara[f] against his slaughter of the pheasants and quails which he had preserved at great cost.[g] The Patriarch and the clergy were left to suffer every kind of humiliating indignity, and worse than indignity. They were constantly exposed to endure actual hunger; their allowance in wine, fish, meat was scanty and irregular; their stipends in money always many months in arrear. They were close prisoners;[h] rigid police watched at the gates of the city: no one could stir without a passport.[i] The Bishop of Ferrara refused them one of the great churches to celebrate Mass according to their own rite: he would not have his holy edifice polluted. Three of them made their escape to Venice, and were ignominiously brought back. A second time they contrived to fly, and found their way to Constantinople. The indignant Patriarch sent home orders that the recreants should be suspended from their office, and soundly flogged.[j] Tidings in the meantime arrived, fortunately exaggerated, that the Ottoman, who had condescended to grant a precarious peace, threatened Constantinople; the Pope evaded the demand for succour. He, indeed, himself was hardly safe. The bands of Nicolas Piccinino, Captain of a terrible Free Company, had seized Forlì and Bologna.

The miserable Greek clergy urged the Patriarch, the slow and irresolute Patriarch at length urged the Emperor, too well amused with his hunting, to insist on the regular opening of the Council. "We must wait the arrival of the ambassadors from the Sovereigns and Princes, of more Cardinals and Bishops; the few at present in Ferrara cannot presume to form an Œcumenic Council." Autumn drew on; with autumn the plague began to appear. Of the 11 Cardinals only 5, of the 160 Bishops only 50

[f] Nicolas III. of Este. Laonicus Chalcondylas takes the opportunity of telling of the Marquis the dreadful story which is the groundwork of Lord Byron's "Parisina."—P. 288, &c.

[g] Raynald. sub ann.

[h] This ancient Italian usage, that no one could leave a city without a passport from the authorities, astonished the Greeks.—Syropulus, p. 141.

[i] Syropulus, ibid. He is indignant: οὕτως ὁ Πνευματικὸς ἀνὴρ τιμᾶν ἔγνω τοὺς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὑπηρέτας.

[j] Syropulus, p. 125.

remained. The Greeks escaped the ravage of the pestilence, all but the Russians: they suffered a fearful decimation.[k]

Not, indeed, that the whole of this time had been wasted in inactivity. Conferences had been held: private Synods, not recognised as formal acts of the Council, had defined the four great points of difference between the Greek and Latin Churches. Scandalous rumours indeed were disseminated that the Greeks were guilty of fifty-four articles of heresy; these charges were disdained as of no authority; but the Greeks were not less affected, and not less despised and hated by the mass of the people for such disclaimer. The Council was at length formally opened; but throughout it was skilfully contrived that while there was the most irreverent confusion among the Greeks, the Patriarch was treated with studied neglect, the Emperor himself, with reluctant and parsimonious honours; the Pope maintained his serene dignity; all the homage paid to him was skilfully displayed. The Greeks were jealous of each other; the courtly and already wavering Prelate of Nicea was in constant collision with the ruder but more faithful Mark of Ephesus; they could not but feel and betray, they knew not how to resent, their humiliation.[m] Their dismay and disgust was consummated by news of the intended adjournment of the Council to Florence. They would not at first believe it; the Emperor was obliged to elude their remonstrances by ambiguous answers. The terrors of the plague, which Syropulus avers had passed away for two months; the promises of better supplies, and more regular payments in rich and fertile Tuscany; the neighbourhood of commodious havens, where they might embark for Greece; above all, starvation, not only feared, but almost actually suffered: all were as nothing against the perils of a journey over the wild and unknown Apennines, perhaps beset by the marauding troops of Piccinino, the greater distance from Venice, and, therefore, from their home. Already the Bishop of Heraclea, the homo-

[k] Syropulus, p. 144.
[m] See all the latter part of the 6th section of Syropulus.

phylax, and even Mark of Ephesus, had attempted flight, and had been brought back by actual force or by force disguised as persuasion.[n]

The clergy with undissembled reluctance,[o] or rather under strong force, the Emperor with ungracious compliance, yielded at length to the unavoidable necessity. The Emperor and the Patriarch, the Pope and his Cardinals found their long way to Florence, not indeed by the ordinary roads, for the enemy occupied Bologna, but, according to the Greeks, with the haste and secrecy of flight; to the Latins, with the dignity of voluntary retirement. The Pope travelled by Modena; the Emperor and the Patriarch by Faenza, and thence in three days over the savage Apennines to Florence.[p]

Journey to Florence.

In Basle, meantime, the Nations continued their sessions, utterly despising the idle menaces of the Pope, and the now concurrent anathemas of the Greeks. The Cardinal Louis Archbishop of Arles, a man of all-respected piety and learning, had taken the place as President, on the secession of Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. But not only Cæsarini, the Cardinal of St. Peter's and many others had fallen off from the Council; the King of Arragon, the Duke of Milan menaced away their Prelates. None, it was said, remained, but those without benefices, or those from the kingdoms of which the Sovereigns cared nothing for these religious disputes. Amadeus of Savoy compelled his Bishops to join the Council, to make up a sufficient number to depose the Pope.[q] The death of the Emperor Sigismund, whose presence in the Council had no doubt raised its credit in the minds of men, was a fatal blow to the cause of Reformation. His son-in-law, Albert, was chosen at Frankfort King of the Romans; but Albert's disposition on this momentous subject was undeclared; his power not yet confirmed. The German Diet now

Basle.

Dec. 9, 1437.

[n] Syropulus, 151.

[o] Καὶ πάντες τὸ τῆς μεταβάσεως δεινὸν ὁμονώς ἐκτραγωδοῦντες καὶ ἀποστείομενοι, καὶ πρὸς ἐμποδισμὸν ταύτης πάντα οσα ἐνὴν λέγοντες.—Syropulus, p. 184.

[p] There is now a noble road from Forlì to Florence; but before this road was made it must have been a wild and terrific journey, especially to the sedentary Greek of Constantinople.

[q] Æneas Sylvius, p. 76.

took a lofty tone of neutrality; they would not interfere in the quarrel (it had sunk into a quarrel) between the Pope and the Council. In vain the Archbishop of Palermo, in the name of the Council, urged that it was the cause of ecclesiastical freedom, of holy religion. Even the great German Prelates heard in apathy.[r]

France. Pragmatic Sanction.

Not so the kingdom of France. On the 1st of May the Gallican Hierarchy, at the summons of the King, assembled in a national Synod at Bourges. The Kings and the clergy of France had seldom let pass an opportunity of declaring their own distinctive and almost exclusive independence on the Papal power. At the same time that they boasted their titles, as inherited from Pepin or Charlemagne as the defenders, protectors, conservators of the Holy See, it was with reservation of their own peculiar rights. They would leave the rest of the world prostrate at the Pope's feet, they would even assist the Pope in compelling their prostration; in France alone they would set limits to, and exercise control over that power. Even St. Louis, the author of the first Pragmatic Sanction, in all other respects the meekest Catholic Christian, was still King of France. The King, or rather the King's advisers, the Legists and the Counsellors in the Parliament, saw that it was an inestimable occasion for the extension or confirmation of the royal prerogative. The clergy, though they had attended in no great numbers, were still in general adherents of the Council of Basle. The doctrines of Gerson and of the University of Paris were their guides. At the great Synod of Bourges the King proposed, the clergy eagerly adopted, the decrees of the Council. Yet though they fully admitted the Assembly of Basle to be a legitimate Œcumenic Council, to which all Christians, the Pope himself, owed submission, they virtually placed themselves above Pope or Council. They did not submit to the Council as Legislator of Christendom; their own consent and re-enactment was necessary to make the decree of Pope or

Synod at Bourges.

[r] These verses are of the time:—

"Ut primum magni cœpit discordia cleri
Dicunt Germani, nos sine parte sumus.
Hoc ubi non rectum docti docuere magistri
Suspendunt animos, guttura non sapiunt."

Council, the laws of the realm of France. The new Pragmatic Sanction now issued admitted certain of the decrees in all their fullness, from the first word to the last; others they totally rejected, some they modified, or partially received. The Synod of Bourges assumed to be a co-ordinate, or, as regarded France, a superior Legislature. It asserted the rights of national churches with plenary authority, a doctrine fatal to the universal monarchy of Rome, but not less so to the unity of the Church, as represented by the Pope, or by a General Council. The Pragmatic Sanction encountered no opposition. It enacted these provisions: the Pope was subject to a General Council, and such General Council the Pope was bound to hold every ten years. The Pope had no power to nominate to the great ecclesiastical benefices, except to a few specially reserved; the right of election devolved on those to whom it belonged. The Court of Rome had no right to the collation to inferior benefices; expectatives or grants of benefices not vacant were absolutely abolished. Appeals of all kinds to Rome were limited to very grave cases. No one was to be disturbed in his possession, who had held a benefice for three years. It restricted the number of Cardinals to twenty-four, none to be named under thirty years of age. Annates and first-fruits were declared simoniacal. Priests who retained concubines forfeited their emoluments for three months. There were some regulations for the performance of divine service. The Mass was to be chanted in an audible voice: no layman was to sing psalms or hymns in the vulgar tongue in churches. Spectacles of all sorts, plays, mummeries, masques, banquets in churches were prohibited. The avoiding all commerce with the excommunicated was limited to cases of great notoriety. The interdict was no longer to confound in one sweeping condemnation the innocent and the guilty.[8]

Thus, then, while Germany receded into a kind of haughty indifference, France, as far as France, had done the work of the Council. The Pragmatic Sanction was

[8] Concilium Bituricense, apud Labbe. Compare Sismondi, Hist. des Français, xii. p. 327. Ordonnances de France, xiii. p. 267, 291. L'Enfant, Hist. du Concile de Bâle.

her reform; the dissolution of the Council by the Pope, the deposition of the Pope by the Council, she did not condescend to notice. England, now on the verge of her great civil strife, had never taken much part in the Council, she had not even resented her non-admission as a Nation. Even Spain and Milan had to a certain extent withdrawn their sanction. But still the Council of Basle maintained its lofty tone; still it must have had deep root in the reverence of mankind, or it must have fallen away in silent, certain dissolution.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

FLORENCE received the strangers from the East with splendid hospitality. The Emperor, after some contest, allowed the Church on this occasion her coveted precedence.[a] The Patriarch arrived first; he was met by two Cardinals and many Bishops. But at Florence curiosity was not highly excited by the arrival of an aged Churchman: he passed on almost unregarded. Three days after came the Emperor; the city was in a tumult of eager wonder; the roofs were crowded with spectators; trumpets and instruments of music rang through the streets; all the bells pealed; but the magnificence of the pomp (so relates the Ecclesiast, not without some ill-suppressed satisfaction) was marred by deluges of rain.[b] The gorgeous canopy held over the Emperor's head was drenched; he and all the spectators were glad to find refuge in their houses.

The Council of Florence began with due solemnity its grave theological discussions, on the event of which might seem to depend the active interference of the West to rescue her submissive and orthodox brethren from the Mahommedan yoke, or the abandonment of the rebellious and heretical race to the irresistible Ottoman. It began with solemn order and regularity. The champions were chosen on each side: on the Latin, the most distinguished were the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, the late President of the Council of Basle, not less eminent for learning than for political wisdom; John, the Provincial General of the Dominican Order in Lombardy, esteemed among the

[a] Laonicus Chalcondylas describes Florence as the greatest and richest city after Venice. Ἡ δὲ Φλωρεντία πόλις ἐστὶν ὀλβιωτάτη μετὰ γε τὴν Οὐενετῶν πόλιν, καὶ ἐπὶ ἐμπορίαν ἅμα καὶ γεωργοὺς παρεχομένη τοὺς ἀστούς. This union of agriculture with trade is, I presume, to distinguish them from the Venetians. He enters into the constitution of Florence.

[b] Syropulus, p. 213.

most expert dialecticians of the West. On the side of the Greeks were Isidore of Russia, the courtly Bessarion, who might seem by his temper and moderation (though not unusual accompaniments of real learning) not to have been without some prophetic foresight of the Cardinalate, and the quiet ease of a Western Bishopric; and Mark of Ephesus, whose more obstinate fidelity aspired to be the Defender, the Saint, the Martyr of his own unyielding Church. If legend were to be believed (and legend is still alive in the full light of history) the Greeks were indeed incorrigible. Miracle was wasted upon them. St. Bernardino of Sienna is said to have displayed the first recorded instance of the gift of tongues since the Day of Pentecost; he disputed fluently in Greek, of which he could not speak or understand one word.[c]

Already at Ferrara the four great questions had been proposed which alone were of vital difference to the Greek and Latin Churches. I. The Procession of the Holy Ghost, whether from the Father alone, or likewise from the Son. II. The use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. III. Purgatory. IV. The Supremacy of the Pope. At Ferrara the more modest discussion had chiefly confined itself to the less momentous questions, those on which the passions were less roused, and which admitted more calm and amicable inquiry, especially that of Purgatory. At Florence they plunged at once into the great absorbing difficulty, the procession of the Holy Ghost. This, though not absolutely avoided at Ferrara, had been debated only, as it were, in its first approaches. Yet, even on this point,[d] where the object with the Latins, and with the more enlightened and best courtiers of the Greeks, was union not separation, agreement not stubborn antagonism, it began slowly to dawn upon their minds that the oppugnancy was in terms rather than in doctrine; the discrepancy, as it was calmly examined, seemed to vanish of itself. The article, however, involved two questions,

[c] Raynaldus sub anno.

[d] The Greeks were manifestly bewildered by the scholastic mode of argument, the endless logical formularies of the Latins (Syropulus, *passim*). They were utterly unacquainted with the Latin Fathers; could not distinguish the genuine from spurious citations; or even understand their language.—Syropulus, p. 218.

one of the profoundest theology, the other of canonical law. I. Which was the orthodox doctrine, the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son? II. Even if the latter doctrine were sound, by what right had the Latin Church of her sole authority, in defiance of the anathema of one or more of the four great Œcumenic Councils, presumed to add the words "and the Son" to the creed of Nicea? Which of these questions should take precedence was debated with obstinacy, not without acrimony. The more rigid Greeks would stand upon the plain fact, which could hardly be gainsaid, the unauthorised intrusion of the clause into the Creed. To the Latins, the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone (the Greek doctrine) was an impious disparagement of the co-equal, co-eternal Godhead of the Son; to the Greeks the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son also, was the introduction of two principles—it ascribed the incommunicable paternity of the Father to the Son.[e] It was discovered at length that neither did the Latins intend to deny the Father to be the primary and sole fountain of Godhead, nor the Greeks absolutely the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. They all acquiesced in the form "of the Father through the Son;" yet in the different sense of the two Greek prepositions, "from and through," Mark of Ephesus and the rigid Greeks fought with a stubborn pertinacity as if their own salvation and the salvation of mankind were on the issue.[f] But the real difficulty was the addition to the Creed. As a problem of high speculative theology, the article might be couched in broad and ambiguous terms, and allowed to sink into reverential silence. The other inevitable question forced itself upon the mind, the popular mind as well as that of the clergy, almost in every service. Whenever the Nicene Creed was read or chanted, the omission of the words would strike the Latins with a painful and humiliating void; it was an admission of their presumption in enlarging the

[e] The Latin argued, εἰ δὶ ὁμολογοῦντες πνεύματος, μὴ ποιοῦντες δύο ἀρχάς, τις ἡ χρεία ἡμεῖς οἱ Λατῖνοι μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν καὶ τοῦ ἀπαλείφειν προσθήκην.—Ducas, c. xxxi.
πηγὴν καὶ ῥίζαν τὸν Πάτερα τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ [f] Syropulus, p. 237.

established Creed—the abasing confession that the Western Church, the Roman Church, had transcended its powers. To the Greek the unusual words jarred with equal dissonance on the ear; the compulsory repetition was a mark of galling subjection, of the cowardly abandonment of the rightful independence of his Church, as well as of truth and orthodoxy. On this point the Latins suffered the humiliation of having produced a copy of the Acts of the Second Council of Nicea, which included the contested words. It was a forgery so flagrant that they were obliged to submit to its rejection without protest.[g] The Greeks drew the natural conclusion that they would not scruple to corrupt their own documents.[h] The Latins were more fortunate or more skilful in some citations from S. Basil and other writers of authority. Their authenticity could not be disproved without awaiting the arrival of other copies from Constantinople. Throughout, the dispute rested on the Greek Fathers; the Greeks somewhat contemptuously avowed their ignorance of the Latin saints.

The Latins had the strength of strenuous union, the Greeks were weakened by discord. Already at Ferrara the more rigid Greeks had seen the accomplished Bessarion of Nicea desert the faithful Mark of Ephesus. On the question of Purgatory they had differed more widely than the conflicting Churches. Their quarrel now degenerated into coarse and personal altercation. "Why do I dispute any longer" (Bessarion so far forgot himself) "with a man possessed by an evil spirit?"[i] Mark, in return, denounced Bessarion as a bastard and an apostate.

The Pope and the Emperor[k] were resolutely determined upon the union. Every art, all influence and authority, were put forth to compel the more refractory to obedience. If the Cardinalate was not yet bestowed or promised to the more obsequious Prelates, Bessarion of Nicea and

[g] The interpolation was traced up to the time of Charlemagne, no higher.

[h] ἐλέγομεν γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, ὡς ἤδη ἔχομεν ἐλέγχειν αὐτοῦς ἐκ τούτου, ὅτι ἐνοθεύθησαν καὶ τὰ ῥητὰ τῶν δυτικῶν ἁγίων.—Syropulus, p. 171.

[i] Syropulus, p. 257.

[k] The Emperor burst out into a furious invective against the Bishop of Heraclea, who had presumed to refute the Imperial arguments: οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἀναισχυντῶν λίγειε ἄπειρ σοὶ οὐκ ἔξεστι. διότι ὑπάρχεις ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀπαίδευτος καὶ βάναυσος καὶ χωρίτης.—P. 224.

Isidore of Russia, the appointments and allowances to the more pliant were furnished with punctuality and profusion, those of the contumacious parsimoniously if at all. The arrears of the disfavoured again extended to many months; they were again threatened with starvation. Christopher, the Pope's former Legate at Constantinople, proposed altogether to withdraw the allowance from Mark of Ephesus, the Judas who ate the Pope's bread and conspired against him.[m] Rumours were spread that Mark was mad. It was skilfully suggested, it was plain to the simplest understanding, that the liberties of the Greeks, perhaps their lives, in a foreign land, were not their own; their return depended on the mercy or the generosity of their antagonists. They might be kept an indefinite time, prisoners, despised, starving prisoners. Their own poor resources had long been utterly exhausted; the Emperor, even the Patriarch, could make or enforce no terms for refractory subjects, who defied alike temporal and spiritual authority.

The Greeks met again and again in their private synod. The debates were long, obstinate, furious; the holy councillors were almost committed in personal violence; the Emperor mingled in the fray, overawing some to adulatory concessions, but not all.[n] The question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost was proposed for their accordance in the mildest and most disguised form; that of the addition to the Creed altogether eluded. There were twenty who declared themselves in favour of the union, twelve not content. But in subsequent meetings (every kind of influence was used, menaces, promises were lavished to obtain suffrages) the majority was gradually swelled by the admission of certain "Grammarians" to vote: the minority dwindled away by the secession of some Bishops through fear or favour, the disfranchisement of three of the cross-bearers and some obstinate monks, as not in holy orders. The Emperor determined that suffrages belonged only to Bishops and

Greeks in discussion.

June 3.

[m] Syropulus, p. 251.

[n] The Bishops of Mitylene and Lacedæmon almost fell tooth and nail on Mark of Ephesus: καὶ μόνον οὐκ ὀδοῦσι καὶ χείρσιν ὥρμων διασπαράξαι αὐτόν.—P. 236.

Archimandrites.[o] At length Mark of Ephesus stood alone, or with one partisan, Sophronius of Anchialus; even Sophronius seems to have dropped away; but in vain the Patriarch wasted all his eloquence on the adamantine Ephesian.

Yet the Emperor would not surrender the liberties of his Church without distinct stipulations as to the reward of his compliance.[p] His sole motive for submission had been the security of his empire, of Constantinople now almost his whole empire.[q] A treaty, negotiated by Isidore of Russia, was duly ratified and signed, with these articles. I. The Pope bound himself to supply ample means, ships and provisions, for the return of the Emperor and the Greeks. II. The Pope would furnish every year two galleys and three hundred men at arms for the defence of Constantinople. III. The ships which conveyed the pilgrims to the Holy Land were to touch at Constantinople. IV. In the Emperor's need the Pope should furnish twenty galleys for six months or ten for a year. V. If the Emperor should require land forces, the Pope would use all his authority with the Princes of the West to supply them.

June 2.

The temporal treaty was signed. With weary haste they proceeded to perfect, to ratify, and to publish the spiritual treaty, which pretended to unite the East and West in holy communion. The Patriarch, who had long been suffering from age and sickness, just lived to see and to sign this first article of his great work. He died suddenly almost in the act of urging his followers to submission. He had already sent off some of his effects to Venice, and hoped to return (happily he did not return) to Constantinople. His obsequies were celebrated with great pomp; and in the Baptistery of Florence the stranger wonders to find the tomb of a Patriarch of Constantinople.

June 9.

The strife seemed to be worn out with this more momentous question. The discomfited and discordant Greeks

[o] Ἡγούμενοι.

[p] Gibbon has noted with his usual sarcasm the protest of the Emperor's dog, who howled fiercely and lamentably throughout his master's speech.—Syropulus, 266.

[q] Syropulus, 261.

had no longer courage or will to contest further.[r] The three other points had already been partially discussed; even that perilous one, the supremacy of the Pope, was passed, reserving only in vague and doubtful terms the rights of the Eastern Patriarchate. Death had silenced the remonstrant voice of the Patriarch. The final edict was drawn by common consent. One only difficulty remained which threatened seriously to disturb the peace. In whose names, on whose authority, should it address the world as a law of Christendom, that of the Emperor the heir of Justinian, or the Pope the successor of St. Peter? The Emperor yielded to a compromise, which seemed to maintain his dignity. It spoke in the name of the Pope Eugenius IV. with the consent of his dear son John Palæologus, Emperor of the Romans, and the representatives of his venerable brethren the Patriarchs. Earth and heaven were summoned to rejoice that the wall had fallen which had divided the Churches of the East and West. The Greeks and Latins are now one people. I. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, but as from one principle, by one operation. The words "from the Son" have been lawfully and with good reason inserted in the Creed. II. In the use of leavened or unleavened bread, each Church might maintain its usage. III. The souls of those who die in less than mortal sin are purified in purgatory, by what fire was not determined, but their sufferings may be shortened or alleviated by the prayers and alms of the faithful. IV. The Roman Pontiff, as successor of St. Peter, has a primacy and government over the whole Catholic Church, but according to the Canons of the Church.[s] The rights and privileges of the other four great Patriarchs, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, are inviolate and inviolable.

[r] There is a remarkable passage, in which Bessarion of Nicea took the opportunity, to the perplexity and astonishment of the Greeks, of asserting their absolute unity with the Latins as to the sole power of the hierarchy to consecrate the Eucharist and to ordain the clergy.—Syropulus, p. 295; but compare p. 278.

[s] About this there was a dispute, on which the Emperor threatened to break off the treaty. The Pope proposed "according to Scripture and the writings of the Saints."—P. 282.

The Acts of the Council of Florence boast the signatures; on the part of the Latins, of the Pope, eight Cardinals, two Latin Patriarchs, of Jerusalem and Grado, two Bishops Ambassadors of the Duke of Burgundy, eight Archbishops, forty-seven Bishops, four Heads of Orders, forty-one Abbots, and the Archdeacon of Troyes. Among the Greeks were the Emperor, the Vicars of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, nineteen Archbishops and Bishops by themselves or by their proctors, the great Dignitaries of the Church of Constantinople, the Head of the Imperial Monastery, and four Abbots. Of these some were compelled to set their hands, the Ecclesiast fairly owns, speaking no doubt of himself among others, from fear. Such were the representatives of the Christian world. The Despot Demetrius still sternly refused; he was to reap his reward in popularity, hereafter to be dangerous to his brother's throne. He retired to Venice in sullen dignity.

The Act was published with imposing solemnity in the Cathedral of Florence. Nothing was wanting to the splendour of the ceremony, to the glory of the Pope. After Te Deum chanted in Greek, Mass celebrated in Latin, the Creed was read with the "Filioque." Syropulus would persuade himself and the world that the Greeks did not rightly catch the indistinct and inharmonious sounds. Then the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini ascended the pulpit and read the Edict in Latin, the Cardinal Bessarion in Greek. They descended and embraced, as symbolising the indissoluble unity of the Church. The Edict (it was unusual) ended with no anathema. Bessarion and Isidore, with the zeal of renegades, had urged the condemnation of their contumacious brethren: they were wisely overruled. Even Mark of Ephesus, whom the Pope would have visited for his stubborn pride (the brave old man adhered to his convictions in the face of the Pope and his Cardinals), was protected by the Emperor. The service in the Cathedral of Florence was in the Latin form, the Pope was on his throne, with his Cardinals, in all his superiority. Greek vanity had expected to impress the Latins by the more solemn majesty of their

rites.[t] They proposed the next day a high Greek function, with the Pope present. The Pope coldly answered, that before they could be permitted in public, the rites must be rehearsed in private. in order that it might be seen whether there was anything presumptuously discordant with the Roman usage. The Greeks declined this humiliating mode of correcting the errors and innovations of the Roman ritual.[u]

Five copies of these Acts were made, and duly signed, that authentic proof of this union might never be wanting to perpetuate its memory to the latest time.

Thus closed the first, the great, Session of the Council of Florence. The Emperor with the Greek Clergy returned to Venice, and, after a long and fatiguing navigation, to Constantinople,[x] there to be received, not as the Saviour of the empire from the sword of the Turks, not as the wise and pious reconciler of religious dissension and the peacemaker of the Church, but as a traitor to his own imperial dignity, as a renegade, and an apostate. Already in Venice signs of rebellion had appeared. The Bishop of Heraclea and the Ecclesiast, compelled to officiate in St. Mark's, revenged themselves by chanting the Creed without the obnoxious interpolation, and by refusing to pray for the Pope.[y] During the voyage the Emperor encountered bitter complaints from the Greeks of the tyranny and exultation of the Latin Clergy. In Constantinople it was eagerly inquired whether they had returned victorious. They confessed with humble and bitter self-reproach that they had sold the faith; that they had yielded in base fear to the Franks.[z] Had they been scourged, imprisoned, put to the torture? they could not plead this excuse. It was openly said that, Judas-like, they had received money and sold the Lord. The Archbishop of Heraclea declared that he had been compelled to the base apostasy, and con-

[t] The only superiority which the Latins seemed obliged to own, was the splendour of the Greek dresses of silk. "A la maniera degli abiti Greci, pareva assai più grave, e più degna che quella de' Prelati Latini."—Vespasiano, Vit. Eugen. IV. Muratori, xxv. p. 261.

[u] ἡμεῖς ἰδαχρεοῦμεν διορθῶσαι πολλὰ σφάλματα τῶν Λατινῶν.—Syropulus, p. 299.

[x] He embarked Oct. 19; arrived in Constantinople Feb. 1.

[y] Syropulus, p. 315.

[z] Ducas, c. xxxi.

fessed his bitter remorse of conscience; he had rather his right arm had been cut off than that he had subscribed the union. At once the Monks and the women broke out into unrestrained fanaticism against the impious Azymites, who had treated the difference of leavened or unleavened bread as trivial and insignificant. The obsequious Bishop of Cyzicum, promoted to the Patriarchate, could not command the attendance of his own dignitaries without the mandate, without threats of severe punishment from the Emperor.[a] He stood even then, in the midst of his sullen retinue, in Santa Sophia, with hardly a single worshipper.[b] The churches where the clergy officiated who had favoured the union, not merely in the metropolis but in the villages around, were deserted by their flocks.[c] The Despot Demetrius raised the standard of Greek orthodoxy in direct rebellion against his brother. His partisans excited the people everywhere, if to less violent, to as stubborn rebellion. Bold had been the Priest who had dared to interpolate the Creed with the hated clause. Even in Russia, the Cardinal Isidore (the wiser Bessarion returned to peace and honour in the West) was met with the same contemptuous, inflexible resistance.

A few short years had entirely obliterated all signs of the union in the East, excepting the more embittered feeling of estrangement and hatred which rankled in the very depths of their hearts towards the Latin Church; and these feelings were only quenched in their blood. For, as they thus indignantly repudiated all connexion with Rome, all subjection to Latin Christianity, the Pope and the Princes of Western Christendom thought no more of their treaty of succour and support against the Turks.

Only fifteen years after the return of the Emperor John Palæologus to the East, Constantinople was a Mohammedan city. S. Sophia, which disdained to be polluted by the "Filioque" in the Creed, resounded, unrebuked,

[a] Syropulus.

[b] He demanded the reason of this from some of his refractory flock. διατὶ ἠκολούθησας καὶ σὺ τῷ πατριάρχῃ καὶ ἐλατίνισας.—P. 337.

[c] Phranza, p. 194. Laonicus Chalcondylas. Ducas, c. xxxi.

with the Imaum's chant, "There is but one God, and Mohammed is his Prophet."

The sole lasting consequence of the Council of Florence, even in the West, was the fame acquired by Pope Eugenius, which he wanted neither the art nor the industry to propagate in the most magnificent terms. He, of all the successors of St. Peter, had beheld the Byzantine Emperor at his feet, had condescended to dictate terms of union to the Greeks, who had acknowledged the superior orthodoxy, the primacy of Rome. The splendid illusion was kept up by the appearance of ecclesiastical ambassadors—how commissioned, invested with what authority, none knew, none now know—from the more remote and barbarous churches of the East, from the uttermost parts of the Christian world. The Iberians, Armenians, the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria, the Chaldean Nestorians, the Ethiopians, successively rendered the homage of their allegiance to the one Supreme Head of Christendom.

CHAPTER XV.

CONTINUATION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE. POPE FELIX.

The Council of Basle, frustrated in its endeavours to secure the advantage to itself of the treaty with the Eastern Emperor, looked on the negotiations at Ferrara and Florence with contemptuous disregard. Its hostility might seem embittered by the success of the Pope in securing the recognition of the Emperor and the Greek Clergy. It was some months before the time when Eugenius triumphantly announced his union with the Byzantine Church, that the Council determined to proceed to the deposition of the Pope. They would before long advance to the more fatal and irrevocable step—the election of his successor.

The Council might seem, in its unshaken self-confidence, to despise the decline in its own importance, from the secession of so many of its more distinguished members, still more from the inevitable consequences of having raised vast expectations which it seemed utterly unable to fulfil. It affected an equable superiority to the defection of the great temporal powers, the haughty neutrality of Germany, and the rival synod of France at Bourges. Even the lesser temporal princes, who had hitherto supported the Council, the Spanish Kings, the Duke of Milan, seemed to shrink from the extreme and irrepealable act—the deposition of the Pope. They began to urge more tardy, if not more temperate, counsels. The debates in the Council became stormy and tumultuous; the few great prelates encountered in bitter altercation. The Archbishop of Palermo, the representative of the King of Arragon, urged delay; he was supported by the Archbishop of Milan, and by others of rank and name. He endeavoured to counteract the growing democratic tendencies of the Council, by asserting the sole and exclusive

right of the Bishops to suffrage. This preliminary debate was long and obstinate.[a] At its close, after the speech of the Cardinal of Arles, a violent collision took place. The old Archbishop of Aquileia arose, and rashly said, "You do not know us Germans; if you go on thus, you will hardly come off without broken heads." The Archbishop of Palermo, Louis the Papal Prothonotary, and others, rose, and with one voice exclaimed that the liberty of the Council was threatened. He called on the Count of Thierstein, the Emperor's representative, who still had his seat in the Council, for his protection. The Count solemnly declared that the peace should be maintained. He was supported by the magistrates and citizens of Basle, who were proud that their town was the seat of the Council, and declared that it should not be disturbed. Still, as the President went on to read the decree, he was interrupted by shouts and unseemly noises. "A miracle," exclaimed the Archbishop of Lyons; "the dumb speak, Bishops who never uttered a word before are now become loquacious." The Cardinal Archbishop of Arles, the President, stood quite alone of his Order, almost alone among the Prelates of the highest rank, in his inflexible fidelity to the Council. His dignity, his unalterable temper, his promptitude and eloquence, which excited the most unbounded admiration, his consummate ability, by which, though a Frenchman, he outmanœuvred the subtle Italians, still maintained his sway. His chief supporters, though of inferior rank, were men of fame for learning. He always happily chose his time: on the second meeting, he carried his point against the Archbishop of Palermo and all the Spanish and Milanese Prelates, who withdrew angry but baffled. "Twice," said the Archbishop in Italian, meaning, twice we have been beaten, or twice overreached.

As the session drew on which was to determine the

[a] See the whole in Æneas Sylvius. Comment. lib. i. Opera, p. 23. The speech of the Cardinal of Arles is of many folio pages. He rashly said that the Archbishop of Milan, though a prelate of the greatest weight and dignity, was no great orator. "As good an orator as you a president," burst in the indignant Lombard. The Cardinal of Arles bore the interruption with patience, and went calmly on (p. 26). He soothed the Bishops with great skill, who were jealous of the suffrages of the inferior clergy. He compared the Council to the Spartans at Thermopylæ.

question of deposition, the Bishops—some from timidity, some from dislike of the proceeding—shrunk away. Of the Spanish Prelates there was not one; from Italy one Bishop and one Abbot; of mitred Prelates from the other two kingdoms (England took no part in the Council) only twenty; their place was filled by clergy inferior in rank, but, according to Æneas Sylvius, much superior in learning. The Cardinal of Arles was embarrassed, but not disheartened, by this defection. The reliques of many famous Saints were collected, borne by the Priests of his party through the city, and actually introduced into the hall of council in the place of the absent Bishops.[b] At the solemn appeal to the Saints in bliss, a transport of profound devotion seized the assembly; they all burst into tears. The Baron, Conrad of Winsperg, the Imperial Commissioner, wept the loudest, and declared that he derived ineffable consolation in the execution of his arduous duty. Though so few Bishops were there, never were the seats so full. Proctors of Bishops, Archdeacons, Provosts, Priors, Presbyters, sate to the number of four hundred or more. Nor did the Council ever proceed with such calm and dignified decency. There was no word of strife or altercation, only mutual exhortation to defend the freedom of the Church.[c]

May 16.

The edict passed almost by acclamation. This act for the deposition of Eugenius condemned the Pope, who was now boasting the success of his inappreciable labours for the union of the whole Church, as a notorious disturber of the peace and unity of the Church, as guilty of simony and perjury, as an incorrigible schismatic, an obstinate heretic, a dilapidator of the rights and possessions of the Church.[d] All Christians were absolved from their oaths and obligations of fealty, and warned that they must neither

[b] "Plurimasque sanctorum reliquias totâ urbe perquiri jussit, ac per sacerdotum manus in sessione portatas, absentium Episcoporum locum tenere." —Æneas Sylvius, lib. ii. p. 43.

[c] "Quos inter nullum unquam probrum, nulla rixa, nulla unquam contentio fuit: sed alter alterum in professione fidei hortabatur, unanimisque omnium esse consensus ad defendendam Ecclesiam videbatur."—Ibid.

[d] The decree is dated May 26.—Labbe. According to the Continuator of Fleury (see Patrici. Act. Concil. Basil.), June 25; the very day on which was announced the union of the Greek and Latin churches.

render obedience nor counsel nor receive favour from the deprived Gabriel Condolmieri. All his acts, censures, inhibitions, constitutions, were declared void and of none effect. The decree of course abrogated all the boasted acts of the Council of Florence. To the astonishment of the Council itself, the ambassadors of the Emperor and of the King of France, the Bishop of Lubeck and the Archbishop of Tours, made almost an apology for their absence in their masters' name, approved the act of the Council, and declared Pope Eugenius IV. an enemy to the truth.[e]

It was thought but decent to interpose some delay between the act for the deposition of Eugenius and the election of his successor. It was determined to wait two months. During those two months the plague, which had raged in the Pope's Council at Ferrara, with impartial severity broke out at Basle. The mortality, not in Basle alone, but in many cities of Southern Germany, was terrible.[f] In Basle the ordinary cemeteries were insufficient; huge pits were dug to heap in the dead. Many of the Fathers died, protesting in their death, with their last breath, and with the Holy Eucharist on their lips, their fearless adhesion to the Council, and praying for the conversion of those who still acknowledged Gabriel for Pope.[g] The aged Patriarch of Aquileia rejoiced that he should bear into the other world the tidings of the deposition of Eugenius. Æneas Sylvius was among the rare examples of recovery from the fatal malady. But the Fathers stood nobly to their post; they would not risk the breaking-up of the Council, even by the temporary abandonment of the city. The Cardinal of Arles set the example; his secretary, his chamberlain, died in his house. The pressing entreaties, prayers, remonstrances of his friends, who urged that on his safety depended the whole influence of the Council, were rejected with tranquil determination. The malediction fulminated against the Council by Eugenius at Florence disturbed not their equanimity. Even at this hour they quailed not. They were described as a horde

[e] Session XXXIV. apud Labbe, sub ann. 1439.

[f] The Bishop of Lubeck died between Buda and Vienna; the almoner of the King of Arragon in Switzerland; the Bishop of Evreux in Strasburg; a great Abbot in Spires.

[g] Æneas Sylvius, lib. ii. p. 47.

of robbers; "at Basle all the devils in the world had assembled to consummate the work of iniquity, and to set up the abomination of desolation in the Church of God." All Cardinals, Prelates, were excommunicated, deposed, menaced with the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. All their decrees were annulled, the brand of heresy affixed on all their proceedings. Against this furious invective the Fathers at Basle published an apology, not without moderation.

The plague had mitigated its ravages; the two months had fully expired; the Council proceeded to the election of a new Pope. The Cardinal of Arles was alone entitled by his rank to be an Elector; in his name there was unanimous assent. It was proposed that three persons should nominate thirty-two, who with the Cardinal should form the Electoral College. The triumvirate were men whose humble rank is the best testimony to their high estimation. John, called the Greek, the Abbot of an obscure Cistercian convent in Scotland; John of Segovia, Archdeacon of Villa Viciosa, Thomas de Corcelles, Canon of Amiens. Lest the most important Nation, the Germans, should take offence at their exclusion, they were empowered to choose a fourth: they named Christian, Provost of St. Peters of Brun, in the diocese of Olmutz, a German by birth.

These theological triumvirs with their colleague named twelve Bishops, seven Abbots, five distinguished divines, nine Doctors of Canon or Civil Law.[h] They were impartially chosen from all the four Nations, Germany, France, Spain, Italy. England alone, unrepresented in the Council, was of course unrepresented in the Conclave.

The Conclave was conducted with the utmost regularity
37th Session. Oct. 24. and a studious imitation of the forms observed by the College of Cardinals. The election, after not many days, was without serious strife; it struck Christen-
38th Session. Oct. 28. dom with astonishment. It was not a Prelate whose vigour and character might guarantee and conduct the reformation in the Church, on the expectation

[h] The numbers in Æneas Sylvius are perplexing. The twelve Bishops, including the Cardinal, were to represent the twelve Apostles. But he names many more. The account in the Acts of Patricius varies in many but not very important particulars.

of which rested all the confidence of the world in the Council of Basle; not a theologian of consummate learning, not a monk of rigid austerity, it was not even a Churchman of tried and commanding abilities. It was a temporal sovereign, who, weary of his crown, had laid it down, but was not unwilling to plunge again into the more onerous business of a Pope: who had retired not into the desert, but to a kind of villa-convent on the beautiful shores of the Lake of Geneva, and whose life at best decent and calmly devout, if not easy and luxurious, had none of the imposing rigour of the old founders of monastic orders. Amadeus of Savoy was summoned from his retreat at Thonon to ascend the Papal throne.[1]

Objections were raised that Amadeus of Savoy was not in holy orders; that he had been married and had children. These difficulties were overruled, and yielded easily to the magnificent eulogies passed on the piety, charity, holiness of the hermit of Ripaille. Some of the secret motives for this singular choice are clear enough. The Pope of Basle must be a Pope, at least for a time, without Papal revenues. Italy, all the patrimony of St. Peter which acknowledged the Pope, was in the possession of Eugenius, and showed no inclination to revolt to the Council. If any of the Transalpine sovereigns would recognise the Antipope, none was likely to engage in a crusade to place him on the throne in the Vatican. The only means of supporting his dignity would be the taxation of the Clergy, which his poor partisans could ill bear; the more wealthy and powerful would either refuse, or resent and pass over to the opposite camp. Amadeus, at first at least, might maintain his own court, if not in splendour, in decency. This, however, was a vain hope. The first act of the Council after the election was the imposition of a

[1] Æneas Sylvius (but we must begin to hear Æneas with more mistrust) attributes the elevation of Amadeus to a deep-laid plot. "Amadeus qui se futurum Papam sperabat" (p. 76). "Sapientiâ præditus dicebatur qui annis jam *octo et amplius* simulatam religionem accepisset, ut papatum consequi posset." He makes Amadeus too far-sighted. Æneas assigns a curious speech to Cardinal Cæsarini. "I was afraid that they would have chosen a poor and a good man; then there had been indeed danger. It is that which stirs the hearts of men and removes mountains. This man hopes to accumulate the wealth of Pope Martin"—Martin's wealth had passed into a proverb—"not to spend his own money." The election, Nov. 5; confirmed, Nov. 17.

tax of a fifth penny on all ecclesiastics, for the maintenance of the state of the new Pope. Perhaps the unpopularity of this measure was alleviated by the impossibility of levying it. It was an idle display of unprofitable generosity. If Christendom had been burthened with the maintenance of two Popes it would have wakened up from its indifference, coalesced in favour of one, or discarded both.

A deputation of the most distinguished Churchmen in Basle, the Cardinal of Arles at their head (he was attended by the Count of Thierstein, the Imperial Commissioner), proceeded to the royal hermitage, there to announce to Amadeus his elevation to the Papal See. Amadeus assumed, if he did not feel, great reluctance. If his retirement and seclusion had not been mere weariness of worldly affairs, and if he was not by this time as weary of his seclusion as he had been of the world, when Amadeus looked down on the shadow of his peaceful retreat, reflected in the blue and unbroken waters of the lake below, he might have serious misgivings in assuming the busy, invidious, and, at least of old, perilous function of an Antipope.[k] He had to plunge into an interminable religious war, with the administration, though without power, of the spiritual affairs of half Christendom, the implacable hatred of the other half. Some difficulties were raised, but not those of a deep or earnest mind. He demurred about the form of the oath, the change of the name, the loss of his hermit's beard. He yielded the two first points, took the oath, and the name of Felix V;[m] the last only on finding out himself, when he appeared as Pope in the neighbouring town of Thonon, the unseemliness of a thick-bearded Pope among a retinue of shaven ecclesiastics.

Though enthroned in the Church of St. Maurice, some months elapsed before his triumphant progress through Switzerland to his coronation at Basle. He had created five Cardinals, who assisted the Cardinal of Arles in the imposing ceremony first of his consecration as Bishop, afterwards his coronation as Pope; his two sons,

June 24, 1440.

[k] It was his avarice which caused the delay, says the unfriendly Æneas. Yet it was natural in him to say, "You have passed a decree suppressing Annates: how is the Pope to be maintained? Am I to expend my patrimony, and so disinherit my sons?"—Fea, p. 78.

[m] Accepts, Dec. 17.

the Duke of Savoy and the Count of Geneva, an unusual sight at a Papal inauguration, stood by his side. Fifty thousand spectators beheld the stately ceremony: the tiara which he wore was of surpassing cost and splendour, said to be worth 30,000 gold crowns.[n]

So then for the last time Christendom beheld the strife of Pope and Antipope, each on their respective thrones, hurling spiritual thunders against each other. The indignation of Eugenius knew no bounds. His denunciations contained all and more than all the maledictions which were laid up in the Papal armoury against usurping rivals. The Fathers of Basle repelled them, if with less virulence, with not less provoking contempt.

But Christendom heard these arguments and recriminations with mortifying indifference. That which some centuries ago would have arrayed kingdom against kingdom, and divided each kingdom within itself, the sovereigns against the hierarchy, or the hierarchy in civil feud, now hardly awoke curiosity. No omen so sure of the decline of the sacerdotal power; never again had it vital energy enough for a schism.

The Transalpine kingdoms indeed took different parts, but with such languid and inactive zeal, that as to the smaller states it is difficult without close investigation to detect their bias. France had already in her synod at Bourges declared in favour of the Council, but expressed cold and discouraging doubts as to its powers of deposing Pope Eugenius and electing another Pontiff. The King spoke of Felix V. as of Monsieur de Savoye, suggested the summoning another Council in some city of France, but took no measure to enforce his suggestion. England was occupied, as indeed was France, with its own internal contests. The King of Arragon alone took an active part, but on both sides, and for his own ends. The kingdom of Naples was his sole object; he would wrest that realm from the feeble pretensions of René of Anjou. At first the devoted ally of Felix, he would transport the Antipope to the shores of Naples, having subdued the kingdom to himself under the Papal investiture, march to Rome with his

[n] Æneas Sylvius, Hist. Concil. Basil. l. ii.

triumphant forces, and place the Antipope in the chair of St. Peter. Amadeus wisely shrunk from this desperate enterprise. The King of Arragon, in a year or two, had changed his game. The Pope Eugenius scrupled not, at the hazard of estranging France, to abandon the helpless Angevine. Alfonso of Arragon became convinced of the rightful title of Eugenius to the Pontificate.

Germany maintained the most cool and deliberate apathy. At three successive Diets at Mentz,[o] at Nuremberg, at Frankfort, appeared the envoys of Basle and of Rome, of Felix and of Eugenius, men of the most consummate eloquence. At Mentz John Bishop of Segovia on the part of Basle, Nicolas of Cusa on the part of Rome, pleaded the cause of their respective masters: they cited authorities which of old would have commanded awful reverence, precedents which would have been admitted as irrefragable, but were heard with languid indifference. At Nov. 30, 1440. Nuremberg with Nicolas of Cusa stood the Archbishop of Tarento and the famous Dominican Torquemada, on the side of Basle the Patriarch of Aquileia. A.D. 1441. At Mentz[p] again Nicolas de Cusa took the lead for the Pope, the Archbishop of Palermo for the Council. The Diet on each occasion relapsed into its ostentatious neutrality, which it maintained at subsequent meetings.[q] A.D. 1443. Even the aggressive measure ventured at length by Eugenius, the degradation of the Archbishop of Cologne and Trèves, as adherents of the heretical Council, and the usurping pseudo-pope, might have passed away as an ineffectual menace; no one would have thought of dispossessing these powerful Prelates. If he

[o] Mentz, Feb. 1440. At Mentz the Diet, before the election of the Emperor Frederick III., in the disdainful assertion of their neutrality, published a declaration in which they sedulously avoided the word Pope. They spoke of Ecclesia Dei, Ecclesia Romana, Sedes Apostolica, as the "cui facienda est adhæsio."—Dax, Nicolas von Cusa, p. 223.

[p] Dax has given Nicolas de Cusa's speech at length. His speech and that of the Archbishop of Palermo are in Wurdtwein.

[q] The speech of Nicolas of Cusa shows the course of argument adopted to annul the pretensions and blast the character of Felix. The whole is represented as an old and deep-laid conspiracy on his part. The Council, the Conclave had been crowded with his obsequious vassals (the four Italian Bishops were, it is true, those of Vercelli, Turin, Aosta, and another); his reluctance to assume the tiara was hypocritical effrontery; even his former abdication of his throne a base simulation of humility.

might hope to raise a strife in Germany by appointing Prelates of noble or rich German houses, there was danger lest the nation might resent this interference with the German Electorate; it might lead to the renunciation of his authority. He must look for other support. To Cologne he named the nephew, to Trèves the natural son, of the Duke of Burgundy.

The Schism seemed as if it would be left to die out of itself, or, if endowed with inextinguishable, obstinate vitality, be kept up in unregarded insignificance. Some of the Fathers of Basle still remained in the city, but had ceased their sessions.[r] The Council of Florence was prorogued to Rome. Eugenius was in undisturbed possession of Italy; Felix in his court at Lausanne, or Geneva. The Popes might still hate, they could not injure, hardly molest each other; they might wage a war of decrees, but no more.

One man alone by his consummate address and subtlety, by his indefatigable but undiscerned influence, restored the Papacy to Italy, never but for one short reign (that of Adrian VI. of Utrecht) to depart from it, himself in due time to receive the reward of his success in nothing less than the Popedom. Eugenius and his successor Pope Nicolas V. enjoyed the fame and the immediate advantage of the discomfiture of the Council of Basle, of its inglorious dissolution. But the real author of that dissolution, of its gradual degradation in the estimation of Europe, of the alienation of the Emperor from its cause; he who quietly drove Pope Felix to his abdication, and even added firmness and resolution to the obstinate and violent opposition of Pope Eugenius, was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

[r] Last session. The 44th. May, 1443.

CHAPTER XVI.

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINI. DISSOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE.

The life of Æneas Sylvius is the history of the dissolution of the Council of Basle; and not only so, but as an autobiography of an Italian, a Churchman, a Cardinal, at length a Pope, the most valuable part of the Christian history of his times—that of the opinions, manners, judgements, feelings of mankind. Contrast it with the rise of high ecclesiastics in former times!

The house of Piccolomini had been among the noblest of Sienna, lords of fortresses and castles. On the rise of the popular government in that city, the Piccolominis sank with the rest of the nobles. Yet the grandfather of Æneas possessed an ample estate. He died early, leaving his wife pregnant. The estate was dissipated by negligent or improvident guardians; the father of Æneas married a noble virgin, but without dowry, except the burthensome one—extraordinary fertility. She frequently bore twins, and in the end had twenty-two children. Ten only grew up, and Piccolomini retired to the quiet town of Corsini, to bring up in humble condition his large family. The plague swept off all but Æneas Sylvius and two sisters.

Æneas Sylvius was born October 18, 1405. His third baptismal name was Bartholomew, that of the Apostle of India. His infancy was not uneventful: at three years old he fell from a wall, was taken up, as supposed, with a mortal wound in his head: at eight was tossed by a bull. At the age of twenty-two he left his father's house, heir to no more than his noble name, went to Sienna, was maintained by his relations, and studied law and letters. The war between Florence and Sienna drove him from his native city to seek his fortunes. Dominico Capranica, named as Cardinal by Pope Martin V., rejected by Pope

Eugenius, espoused the cause of the Council of Basle. He engaged the young Piccolomini as his secretary. After a perilous voyage Æneas reached Genoa, travelled to Milan, where he saw the great Duke Philippo Maria, and passed the snowy St. Gothard to Basle. Capranica, though he resumed his Cardinalate on the authority of the Council, was too poor to keep a secretary. Æneas found employment in the same office, first with Nicodemo Scaligero, Bishop of Freisingen, son of the Lord of Verona; him he accompanied to Frankfort: afterwards with Bartolomeo Visconti, Bishop of Novara. With the Bishop of Novara he returned to Italy; by his own account, through his eloquence obtained the Rectorship of the University of Pavia for a Novarese of humble birth, against a Milanese of noble family and powerful connexions. With the Bishop of Novara he went to Florence, to the Court of Pope Eugenius: he visited the famous Piccinino, and his own kindred at Sienna. On his return to Lombardy he found his master, the Bishop of Novara, under a charge of capital treason.[a] The Bishop and his secretary Piccolomini found refuge under the protection of the Cardinal of Santa Croce (Albergati). The Cardinal was sent as Legate to France, to reconcile the Kings of France and England, Charles VII. and Henry VI. In attendance on the Cardinal Æneas passed a third time through Milan, crossed the St. Bernard, and descended on the Lake of Geneva. At Thonon he saw Amadeus of Savoy, afterwards the Pope Felix V. of the Council of Basle, in his hermitage, living, as he says, a life of pleasure rather than of penance.[b] They proceeded to Basle, not yet at open war with Pope Eugenius, dropped down the Rhine to Cologne, took horse to Aix-la-Chapelle, Liege, Louvain, Douay, Tournay, to Arras. The Cardinal di Santa Croce began his difficult function of mediating between the French, the English, and the Burgundians.

Æneas was despatched on a special mission to Scotland,

[a] Had he been tampering with Pope Eugenius against the Pope's enemy the Visconti?

[b] "Magis voluptuosam quam pœnitentialem."

to restore a certain prelate to the favour of the King. He went to Calais. The suspicious English would not permit him to proceed or to go back. Fortunately the Cardinal of Winchester arrived from Arras, and obtained for him permission to embark. But the English looked with jealousy on the secretary of the Cardinal of Santa Croce, whom they accused of conspiring to alienate Philip of Burgundy from their cause. He was refused letters of safe conduct; he must be employed in some hostile intrigue with the Scots. During this delay Æneas visited the wonders of populous and most wealthy London. He saw the noble church of St. Paul's, the sumptuous tombs of the kings at Westminster, the Thames, with the rapid ebb and flow of its tide, and the bridge like a city.[c] But of all things, the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury most excited his amazement, covered with diamonds, fine double pearls,[d] and carbuncles. No one offered less than silver at this shrine. He crossed to Flanders, went to Bruges, took ship at Ecluse, the most frequented port in the West, was blown towards the coast of Norway, encountered two terrible storms, one of fourteen hours, one of two nights and a day. The sailors were driven so far north that they did not know the stars. The twelfth day a lucky north wind brought them to Scotland. In a fit of devout gratitude Æneas walked barefoot ten miles to Our Lady at Whitchurch, but suffered so much from exhaustion and numbed feet that he hardly got to the court. He was received by the King with great favour, obtained the object of his mission, his expenses were paid, and he was presented with fifty nobles and two horses for his journey.

The Italian describes Scotland as a cold country, producing little corn, almost without wood. "They dig out of the earth a kind of sulphurous stone, which they burn." Their cities have no walls, their houses are mostly built without mortar, the roofs of turf, the doors of the cottages bulls' hides. The common people are poor and rude, with plenty of flesh and fish; bread is a delicacy. The

[c] He saw also a village, where men were *said* to be born with tails.

[d] Unionibus.

"And in his cup an *union* shall he throw
Richer than that which four successive kings
On Denmark's throne have worn."
Hamlet, v. 2.
—See Nares' Glossary.

men are small and bold; the women of white complexion, disposed to sexual indulgence.[e] They had only imported wine.[f] They export to Flanders hides, wool, salt-fish and pearls.[g] The Scots were delighted by nothing so much as abuse of the English. Scotland was divided into two parts: one cultivated (the lowlands); one forest (the highlands) without corn-fields. The forest Scots spoke a different language, and lived on the barks of trees.[h] During the winter solstice, the time when Æneas was there, the days were only four hours long.

Æneas had suffered enough in his sea voyages; he determined to run all hazards, and find his way through England. He was fortunate in his resolution: the ship in which he was about to embark foundered at the mouth of the haven. The captain, who was returning to Flanders to be married, with all the passengers and crew, were drowned in sight of shore. Æneas set off disguised as a merchant. He passed the Tweed in a boat, entered a large town about sunset, found lodging in a cottage where he was housed, and supped with the parish priest. He had plenty of broth, geese and fowls; neither wine nor bread. All the women of the town crowded to see him, as to see a negro or an Indian in Italy. They asked who he was, whether he was a Christian. Æneas had been warned of the scanty fare which he would find on his journey, and had provided himself in a certain monastery (there no doubt alone such luxuries could be found) with some loaves of bread and a measure of red wine. This heightened the wonder of the barbarians, who had never seen wine nor white bread. Some women with child began to handle the bread and smell the wine. Æneas was too courteous not to gratify their longings, and gave them the whole. The supper lasted till the second hour of the night, when the priest, his host, and his children, and all the men, took leave of Æneas, and said that they

[e] Æneas adds that kissing women in Scotland meant no more than shaking hands in Italy. Like Erasmus later in England, he drew Italian conclusions from Northern manners.

[f] Their horses were small hackneys, mostly geldings. They neither curried nor combed them. They had no bridles!

[g] Margaritas.

[h] He says also that there were no woods in Scotland. Rooks (*cornices*) were newly introduced, and therefore the trees whereon they built belonged to the King's Exchequer!

must retire to a certain tower a long way off for fear of the Scots, who, on the ebb of the tide, were wont to cross over and plunder. No entreaties could induce them to take Æneas with them, nor any of their women, though many of them were young girls and handsome matrons. The enemy would do them no harm: the borderers' notions of harm were somewhat peculiar.[1] The Italian remained with his two servants, a single guide, and a hundred women, who sat round the fire all night spinning hemp and talking with his interpreter. After great part of the night was passed, there was a violent barking of dogs and cackling of geese. The women ran away, the guide with them, and there was as great confusion as if the enemy were there. Æneas thought it most prudent to stay in his chamber (it was a stable), lest, being quite ignorant of the ways, he might run into the arms of the mosstroopers. Presently the women and the guide returned: it was a false alarm.

Æneas set out the next morning. When he arrived at Newcastle (said to be a work of the Cæsars) he seemed to have returned to the habitable world, so rugged, wild, and bleak was the whole Border. At Durham he visited the tomb of the venerable Bede. At York, a large and populous city, there was a church famous throughout the world for its size and architecture, with a most splendid shrine, and with glass walls (the rich and large windows) between very slender clustered pillars. (Had Æneas seen none of the German or Flemish Gothic cathedrals?) On his way southward he fell in with one of the judges of the realm, returning to his court in London. The judge began to talk of the business in Arras, and, not suspecting who Æneas was, to abuse the Cardinal of Santa Croce as a wolf in sheep's clothing. In the company of the judge, who, had he known who he was, would have committed him to prison, he arrived safe in London. There he found a royal proclamation that no foreigner should leave

[1] "Qui stuprum inter mala non ducunt." It must be remembered that Æneas picked up all he learned through an interpreter, probably a man who knew a few words of bad Latin. I owe perhaps an apology for inserting this scene, so irresistibly characteristic, if not quite in its place. Walter Scott, if I remember, had seen it in his multifarious reading.

the realm without a passport, which he cared not to ask for. He got away by bribing the officers, a matter of course, as such personages never refuse hard money. He crossed from Dover to Calais, thence to Basle and to Milan. Finding that the Cardinal of Santa Croce had been sent back from Florence, and had passed by the Valley of the Adige, and over the Arlberg to Basle, he returned over the Alps by Brig, and joined his master at Basle.

Æneas was an Italian in his passions, and certainly under no austere, monkish self-control. His morals were those of his age and country. His letters are full of amatory matters, in the earlier of which, as he by no means counsels his friends to severe restraint, he does not profess to set them an example. Licentiousness seems to be a thing of course. He was not yet in holy orders; to do him justice, as yet he shrank from that decided step, lest it should involve him in some difficulties.[k] His confessions are plain enough; he makes no boast of constancy.[m] But the most unblushing avowal of his loose notions appears in a letter to his own father, whom he requests to take charge of a natural son. The mother of his son was an Englishwoman whom he met at Strasburg, of no great beauty, but who spoke Italian with great ease and sweetness. "It was the beauty of her eloquence by which Cleopatra enthralled not Mark Antony only, but Julius Cæsar." He anticipates his father's objection to the sinfulness of his conduct, in being a parent without being a husband. He had done only what every one else did. God had made him prone to desire: he did not pretend to be holier than David, or wiser than Solomon. He borrows the language of Terence—"Shall I, weak man that I am, not do that which so many great men have done?" But his examples are not the gods of the heathen lover in the comedy, but Moses, Aristotle, and some good Christians.[n] Let us hastily despatch this, if not the

[k] "Cavi ne me sacer ordo involveret."—Epist. l.

[m] "Ego plures vidi amavique fœminas, quarum exinde potitus, magnum tædium suscepi."—Epist. xlvi. Compare the coarse pleasantry, Epist. lxii. He was averse to German women: he could not speak German.

[n] "Mecumque quis reprehendit, inquam, si ego humuncio faciam, quod maximi viri non sunt aspernati. Interdum Moysen, interdum Aristotelem,

least curious, not the most edifying passage in the life of the future Pope. Later in life he was seized with a paroxysm of virtue, and writes some letters on such subjects in a more grave and ecclesiastical tone. In an epistle written at the approach of Lent, he urges his friend to flee all womankind, as a fatal pestilence. When you look on a woman you look on the devil. He had himself erred often, too often; and he acknowledges that he had become more correct, not from severe virtue, but from the advance, it must have been, of premature age. He consoled himself, however, for one vice which he could not indulge, by another. The votary of Venus (his own words) had become the votary of Bacchus. To his new god he will be faithful to death. Æneas must then have been between thirty-five and forty years old.[o]

He was forty when he wrote his celebrated Romance, Euryalus and Lucretia, a romance with neither incident nor invention;[p] in its moral tone and in the warmth of its descriptions, as in its prolixity, a novel of Boccaccio, but without his inimitable grace; yet Æneas no doubt thought that he infinitely surpassed Boccaccio's vulgar Italian, by his refined and classical Latinity. In the penitential Letter on this subject, in later life (after he was Pope!) the lingering vanity of the author still struggles with his sense of decency.[q]

So, then, the Siennese adventurer has visited almost every realm of Northern Europe, France, Germany, Flanders, Scotland, England; he is in the confidence

nonnunquam Christianos in exemplum sumebam." — Epist. xv. The publication, or at least the admission of this letter into a collection published after the Popedom of Æneas, is singular enough. But even this letter is modesty compared to Epist. xxiii.

[o] "Tum quoque et illud verum est languescere vires meas, canis aspersus sum, aridi nervi sunt, ossa cariosa, rugis corpus aratum est. Nec ulli ego fœminæ possum esse voluptati, nec voluptatem mihi afferre fœmina potest. Baccho magis quam Veneri parebo: vinum me alit, me juvat, me oblectat, me beat: hic liquor suavis mihi erit usque ad mortem. Namque ut fateor, magis me Venus fugitat, quam ego illam horreo." The letter (Epist. xcii.) is written to John Freund, Prothonotary of Cologne, not long after the diet of Nuremberg, A.D. 1442.

[p] The disgraceful history is probably a true one.

[q] Epist. cccxv. There were two things in the book, a too lascivious love story and an edifying moral. Unhappily many readers dwelt on the first; hardly any, alas! attended to the latter. "Ita impravatum est atque obfuscatum infelix mortalium genus." He adds, "Nec privatum hominem pluris facite quam Pontificem; Æneam rejicite, Pium suscipite."

of Cardinals, he is in correspondence with many of the most learned and influential men in Christendom.

No sooner was Æneas fixed at Basle, than his singular aptitude for business, no doubt his fluent and perspicuous Latin, his flexibility of opinion, his rapidly growing knowledge of mankind, his determination to push his fortunes, his fidelity to the master in whose service he happened to be, opened the way to advancement; offices, honours, rewards crowded upon him. He was secretary,[r] first reporter of the proceedings, then held the office as writer of the epistles of the Council.[s] He was among the twelve Presidents chosen by the Council. The office of these duodecemvirs was to prepare all business for the deliberation of the Council; nothing could be brought forward without their previous sanction, nor any one admitted to the Council till they had examined and approved his title. He often presided over his department, which was that of faith. The leaden seal of the Council was often in his custody. During his career he was ambassador from the Council three times to Strasburg, twice to Constance, twice to Frankfort, once to Trent, later to the Emperor Albert, and to persuade Frederick III. to espouse the cause of the Council.

His eloquence made him a power. His first appearance with a voice in the Council seems to have been in the memorable debate on the prorogation of the Council to Italy. We have heard that, while the Pope insisted on the removal of the Council to Florence or Udine, the Council would remove only to Avignon. The Duke of Milan, by his ambassadors, urged the intermediate measure, the adjournment to the city of Pavia. But his ambassador, Isidore Bishop of Rossano, was but an indifferent orator. He talked so foolishly that they were obliged to silence him. Æneas had been twice or three times at Milan; he was not averse to make friends at that powerful Court; nor was he disinclined by taking a middle course to wait the issue of events. He obtained permission of the President, the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, and urged in a speech of two hours, which excited the greatest admira-

[r] Scriba. [s] Abbreviator major.

tion, the claims of Pavia against Florence, Udine, and Avignon. His zeal was not unrewarded. The Archbishop presented him to the Provostship of St. Lawrence in Milan. His rival Isidore remonstrated against the appointment of a stranger. He protested before the Council; the Council was unanimously in favour of Æneas. He went to Milan, but found that the Chapter had already elected a Provost of the noble house of Landriano, whom he found in actual possession. But the Duke, the Archbishop, and the Court were all-powerful; the intruder was expelled. At Milan Æneas was seized with a fever, which lasted seventy-five days, and was subdued with great difficulty.[t] On his return to Basle, he recovered his health so far as to be able to preach the commemoration sermon on the day of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. This sermon by one not in orders was opposed by the theologians, but met with great success.

The war had now broken out between the Pope and the Council; there was no middle ground; every one must choose his side. None, so long as he was in the service of the Council, and the Council in the ascendant, so bold, so loyal a partisan, or with such lofty conceptions of the superiority of the Council over the Pope, as Æneas Piccolomini. As historian of the Council, he asserts its plenary authority. The reasons which he assigns for undertaking this work are characteristic. He had begun to repent that he had wasted so much time in the idle and unrewarded pursuits of poetry, oratory, history. Was he still to live improvident as the birds of the air or the beasts of the field? Was he never to be in possession of money, the owner of an estate? The true rule of life is, that a man at twenty should strive to be great, at thirty prudent, at forty rich. But, alas! the bias was too strong: he must write history.

Throughout that history he is undisguisedly, inflexibly, hostile to Eugenius IV.[u] He sums up with great force

[t] He relates that a certain drug was administered, which appeared to fail in its operation. He was about to take a second dose, when the first began to work: "ut nonaginta vicibus assurgere cogeretur."

[u] The reader must not confound two distinct histories, one, that published in Brown, Fasciculus, and in his Works; the other by Fea, in Roms, as late as the year 1822. I cite this as "Fea."

and clearness, irrefragably, as he asserts, to his own mind, irrefragably it should be to the reason of men, the whole argument for the supremacy of the Council over the Pope. Words are wanting to express his admiration of the President of the Council, the Cardinal Archbishop of Arles: his opponents are secret or timid traitors to the highest Church principles. Eugenius IV. sinks to plain Gabriel Condolmieri.[x] Æneas does not disguise his contempt. He reproaches the Pope with perfidy, as seeking either to dissolve the Council or to deprive it of its liberty. He is severe against the perjury of those who had deserted the Council to join the Pope. Nicolas of Cusa, the *Hercules* of the apostasy, is guilty of schism. So he continues to the end: still he is the ardent panegyrist of the Cardinal of Arles, after the declaration of the heresy of Pope Eugenius, after the deposition of that Pope, even after the election of Pope Felix.

On the death of the Emperor Sigismund, Albert of Austria, elected King of the Romans, hesitated to accept the dignity. The Hungarians insisted that he had been raised to the throne of Hungary on the express condition that he should not be promoted to the Empire. Bartolomeo, Bishop of Novara, the ambassador of Philip Duke of Milan to Vienna, persuaded Æneas, either as empowered, or thought to be empowered, by the Council, to accompany him on this important mission. An address, drawn by Æneas, not only induced Albert to accept the Imperial Crown, but won over the Hungarians, more than to consent, even to urge their King to this step. The grateful thanks of the Diet were awarded to Æneas. But Æneas took great dislike to Vienna, where he was afterwards to pass so many years: he returned to Basle. A.D. 1438.

He returned at a fearful time. During the sixty days, it has been said, between the deposition of Eugenius IV. and the election of his successor, the plague raged at Basle. Some of the dearest friends of Æneas fell around him. He was himself among the few who had the malady and

[x] "Quocirca mentita est iniquitas Gabrieli, et perdidit eum Dominus in malitiâ suâ."—Lib. ii. sub init.

recovered. He might well ascribe his cure to Divine goodness. Æneas preferred piety to science. There were two famous physicians, one a Parisian of admirable skill without religion, the other a German, ignorant but pious. The nature of a certain powder administered to Æneas (the rest of the mode of cure is fully detailed[y]) the pious doctor kept a profound secret. The patient was in a high fever, delirious, and so far gone as to receive extreme unction. A rumour of his death reached Milan; his Provostship was given away; on his recovery he found great difficulty in resuming it. He wrote to his patron the Duke, urging that the fact of his writing was tolerably conclusive proof that he was alive.

Æneas was not without his place of honour in the great affair of the election of the new Pope. He might indeed have been an Elector. There were but few Italians in the Conclave. The consent of more was earnestly desired. Æneas was urged to accumulate the minor orders, with the subdiaconate and diaconate which might qualify him for the suffrage. He was still unwilling to fetter himself with the awful sanctity of Holy Orders. He was first employed in the difficult negotiations as to the appointment of the Electors. He was afterwards one of the two Masters of the Ceremonies. He now describes himself as Canon of Trent. This canonry had been granted to him by the grateful Council, and was held with his Provostship of St. Laurence in Milan. On the ceremonial of the Conclave he is full and minute, as one who took no small pride in the arrangements. To his office was attached the duty of standing at the window to receive from the Vice-Chamberlain the food for the use of the Conclave, and to take care that no letters or other unlawful communications were introduced. No doubt his particular account of the kinds of food, in which the Electors indulged, is faithful and trustworthy. He takes care to inform us of the comical anger of the Archdeacon of Cracow, who was allowed to have his dishes of mutton or

A.D. 1439.

[y] The bubo was in the left groin, the vein of the left foot therefore was opened. He was not allowed to sleep. He took the powder; cataplasms alternately of green radish and of moist chalk were applied to the sore.

lamb, but complained bitterly that he might not have his poultry or game, or perhaps small birds.[z]

Æneas hailed the election of Amadeus of Savoy with the utmost satisfaction; he had forgotten the Epicurean life of the hermit which he had witnessed at Ripaille. The intrigues and the parsimony of Amadeus darkened on his knowledge at a later period. The splendid eulogy, which he makes a nameless Elector pronounce, might seem to come from the heart of Æneas, as far as his eloquence ever did proceed from the heart. Pope Eugenius is still the odious and contemptible Gabriel. In a letter to his friend John of Segovia, he describes in rapturous terms the coronation of Felix V., the gravity, majesty, ecclesiastical propriety of his demeanour: "the demeanour of him who had been called of God to the rule of his Universal Church."[a] Fifty thousand spectators rejoiced, some wept for joy. The vain Æneas will not be silent as to his own part in this splendid ceremonial, though it bordered on the ludicrous. The Cardinal of Santa Susanna chanted the service; the responses were given by the advocates and notaries[b] in such a dissonant bray, that the congregation burst into roars of laughter. They were heartily ashamed of themselves. But the next day when the preachers were to make the responses, Æneas, though quite ignorant of music (which requires long study), sang out his part with unblushing courage.[c] Æneas does not forget the tiara worth 30,000 pieces of gold, the processions, the supper or dinner to 1000 guests. He is as full and minute as a herald, manifestly triumphing in the ceremonial as equalling the magnificence, as well as imitating to the smallest point that of Rome.

The Antipope was not ungrateful to his partisan, whose eloquent adulation published his fame and his virtues to still doubtful and vacillating Christendom. Æneas became the secretary of Pope Felix, he was not only his attendant in public, he became necessary to him, and followed him to Ripaille, Thonon, Geneva, Lausanne.

Æneas secretary to Pope Felix.

[z] Aviculas.

[a] Epist. ad Joann. Segoviens. Opera, 61, 3.

[b] Advocati et scriniarii.

[c] Cantitare meum carmen non erubui.

Frederick III. had now succeeded to the Imperial throne. On his adhesion or rejection depended almost entirely the fate of the rival Popes. Who so able, who (might Felix suppose) so true and loyal, who with such consummate address to conduct his cause before the King of the Romans, who so deeply pledged to the justice and holiness of that cause, as his faithful Secretary? Æneas is despatched by Pope Felix to the Imperial Court.

A.D. 1440.

At the Court of Frederick the eloquent and dextrous Italian made a strong impression on the counsellors of the young Emperor, Silvester Bishop of Chiem, and James Archbishop and Elector of Treves. Frederick was urged to secure the services of a man so experienced in affairs, so gifted, so accomplished. Nothing could be more skilful than the manner in which the Emperor was recommended to secure his attachment. Of all his accomplishments, Æneas was most vain of his poetry. The Emperor appointed him his Laureate;[d] to his letters Æneas for some time prefixed the proud title of Poet. He says, that he did this to teach the dull Viennese, who thought poetry something mischievous and abominable, to treat it with respect.[e]

Æneas secretary to Frederick III.

Yet he made some decent resistance; he must return to Basle and obtain his free discharge from Felix. He wrung with difficulty, and only by the intervention of his friends, the reluctant assent of the Antipope. On the arrival of the Emperor at Basle, he was named Imperial Secretary, and took the oaths of fidelity to Frederick III.; he accompanied his new Lord to Vienna. Æneas saw the turning-point of his fortunes, and never was man so deliberately determined to push forward those fortunes. "You know," he writes to a friend not long after his advancement, "that I serve a Prince who is of neither party, and who by holding a middle course seeks to enforce unity. The Servant must have no will but that of his Master."[f] Æneas hopes to obtain

Nov. 1442.

[d] The diploma of poet, dated July 27, 1442.

[e] Epist. c.

[f] There is something curious in his observation about the Archbishop of Palermo, who was labouring hard at Frankfort about his writings. "Stultus est qui putat libellis et codicibus movere reges." Æneas is learning to know more of kings.

a place for his friend at Vienna. "How this may be I know not. In the meantime I shall insinuate myself into the King's graces: his will shall be mine, I will oppose him in nothing. I am a stranger. I shall act the part of Gnatho: what they affirm, I affirm; what they deny, I deny.[g] Let those that are wise have their fame, let those that are fools bear their own disgrace; I shall not trouble myself about their honour or their discredit. I shall write, as Secretary, what I am ordered, and no more. I shall hold my tongue and obey: if I should do otherwise, it would not be for my interest, and my interest, you will allow, should be my first object." It will soon appear how much stronger was the will of the subtle Italian than that of the feeble and irresolute Emperor.

Æneas was for a time not unfaithful to the Council. Already indeed, before he left Basle, he had made the somewhat tardy discovery that their affairs were not altogether governed by the Holy Ghost, but by human passions. He began to think neither party absolutely in the right. He was gently, but rapidly veering to the middle course, then held by his master the Emperor. Yet he treated the arguments of John Carovia, orator of Pope Eugenius, with sufficient disdain. "You say that the Pope has made more ample concessions to the Princes of Germany, and has humbled himself more than was ever heard of Roman Pontiff. This stuff may pass with peasants and those who are utterly ignorant of history." God alone, Æneas still asserts, is superior to a General Council. "You and your party desire unity; that is, on your own terms; if your Pope remain Supreme Pontiff." He more than hints the abdication of Eugenius. "He deserves greatest praise not who clings to his dignity, but who is ready to lay it down. Of old holy men were with greater difficulty prevailed on to be elevated to the Popedom than they are now removed from it. A good disposition and a gentle spirit would not seek in what manner—but how speedily, he might resign."[h] "In truth," he adds, "the quarrel is not for the sheep but for the wool; there would be less strife were the Church poor."

[g] Ego peregrinus sum: consultum suscipere, aiunt aio, negant nego. Epist. mihi est Gnathonis offensum (officium?) xlv. p. 531.

[h] Epist. xxv.

Æneas at first, notwithstanding his prudential determinations, was an object of much jealousy at the Court of the Emperor. William Taz, a Bavarian, was acting as Imperial Chancellor, in the absence of Gaspar Schlick, who had filled that high office under three Emperors, Sigismund, Albert, and Frederick. The Bavarian hated Italians; he thwarted Æneas in every way. The Secretary bore all in patience.[i] Better times came with the return of Gaspar Schlick to the Court. At Sienna Gaspar had received some civilities, and made friendship with certain kinsmen of the Piccolomini. The enemy of Æneas, William Taz, who had trampled on the Secretary, began humbly to truckle to him. Taz, however, soon left the Court. His other adversaries, as he rose in favour with the Emperor, became his humble servants. He was one of the four distinguished persons appointed to hear at Nuremberg the debate before the Diet.

Æneas, his young blood no longer remonstrating against his committing himself to Holy Orders, now entered into the priesthood. His orders of subdeacon, deacon, priest, followed rapidly on each other. He had ceased to dread the sacred office. He no longer desired to indulge the levity of a layman; his whole delight was henceforth to be in his holy calling.[k] He was not long without reward for this decided step. His first benefice, obtained through the Emperor's interest, was a singular one for an Italian born in sunny Sienna, and whose life had been passed in journeys, councils, and courts. It was the parochial cure of a retired valley in the Tyrol. It was worth sixty gold pieces a year. It was accessible only up one wild glen, covered with snow and ice three parts of the year. The peasants during the long winter were confined to their cottages, made boxes and other carpenter's work (like the Swiss of Meyringen and elsewhere), which they sold at Trent and Botzen. They

Æneas in Holy Orders.

[i] Auriculas declinavi, ut iniquæ mentis asellus: so Æneas writes of himself.

[k] Jam ego subdiaconus sum, quod olim valde horrebam. Sed recessit a me illa animi levitas, quæ inter laicos crescere solebat. Jamque nihil magis amo quam sacerdotium. Epist. xciii. This letter is in unfortunate juxtaposition with the one (Epist. xcii.) in which he gives so much good advice to his friend, makes such full confession of his own former frailties, with the resolution to abandon Venus for Bacchus. See above.

passed much time in playing at chess and dice, in which they were wonderfully skilful. They were a simple people, knew nothing of war or glory or gold. Cattle was their only wealth, which they fed with hay in the winter. Some of them had never tasted any liquor but milk. Some lived a great way from the church: if they died their bodies were laid out and became frozen. In the spring the curate went round, collected them into one procession, and buried them all together in the churchyard. There was not much sorrow at their funerals. Æneas does not flatter the morality of his parishioners (he did not do much to correct it). They would have been the happiest of mankind had they known their blessings and imposed restraint on their lusts. As it was, huddled together night and day in their cottages, they lived in promiscuous concubinage: a virgin bride was unknown. Æneas had some difficulty (every one seems to have had difficulty where the rights of patrons were in perpetual conflict, and the Pope and the Council claimed everything) in obtaining possession of his benefice. Small as was its income, with his canonry it furnished a modest competency, two hundred ducats a year, with which he was fully content. He was anxious to retire from the turbulent world; to secure, as he had passed the meridian of life, a peaceful retreat where he might serve God.[m] We read in the next sentence in his Commentaries that he had given up his happy valley for a better benefice in Bavaria, that of Santa Maria of Auspac, not far from the Inn, which was given him by the Bishop of Passau.

As yet we do not see (when shall we see?) much indulgence of this unworldly disposition: in this respect it is impossible to deny the rigid self-denial of Æneas. In a letter to Gaspar Schlick, the Chancellor, the Italian opens his whole mind. He does not attempt to conceal his own falsehood; he justifies it as of necessity. "Where all are false we must be false too; we must take men as they are." He adduces as authority for this insincerity (I hardly venture to record this) what he dares to call a

[m] Vellem aliquando me sequestrare ab hujus mundi turbinibus, Deoque servire et mihi vivere. Epist. liv. It was the Sarontana vallis?

departure from truth in Him that was all truth."[n] This letter embraces the whole comprehensive and complicated range of Imperial politics, Austria, Bohemia, Hungary. In the great question Æneas has become a stern neutralist. The plan proposed by Charles of France, at the close of 1443, to compel the Council and the Pope to union, now appears the wisest as well as the most feasible measure. "Let the temporal Sovereigns hold their Congress, even against the will of the Clergy, union will ensue. He will be the undoubted Pope, to whom all the Sovereigns render obedience. I see none of the Clergy who will suffer martyrdom in either cause. We have all the same faith with our rulers; if they worshipped idols we should likewise worship them. If the secular power should urge it, we should deny not only the Pope but Christ himself. Charity is cold, faith is dead: we all long for peace: whether through another Council or a Congress of Princes I care not."[o]

In the Diet of Nuremberg nothing was done in the momentous affair. Germany and Frederick III. maintained their cold neutrality. Æneas had sunk to absolute indifference. Another letter to the Pope's Orator Carvajal is in a lighter tone: "You and I may discuss such matters, not as angry theologians, but as calm philosophers. I am content to leave such things to divines, and to think as other people think." He does not speak with much respect of the Diet. "What has it done?—it has summoned another. You know my saying: 'No Diet is barren: this will be as prolific as the rest: it has another in its womb.'"[p]

A.D. 1444.

Oct. 1444.

But the tide now turned. Alfonso II., King of Arragon, his most obstinate and dangerous enemy, made peace with Eugenius. Philippo Maria, Duke of Milan, made peace with Eugenius: all Italy acknowledged Eugenius. The Italian Æneas had no notion of condemning himself to perpetual, if honourable, exile in cold, rude Germany. The churchman would not sever

Change in favour of Eugenius.

[n] Sed fingendum est, postquam omnes fingunt. Nam et Jesus finxit se longiùs ire. Ut homines sunt ita utamur. Æneas should have stuck to his Terence.—liv. p. 539.

[o] Epist. liv.

[p] Epist. lxxii. Compare Æneas Sylvius (Fea), p. 84.

Christendom from Rome, or allow an Ultramontane Papacy to proclaim its independence, if not its superiority. Yet beyond the Alps to less keen eyes never might the cause of Eugenius appear more desperate. The Council, in its proclamations at least, maintained its inflexible resolution. Writings were promulgated throughout Germany, among others a strong manifesto from the University of Erfurt, calling on the German nation to throw off its inglorious neutrality, and at once to espouse the cause of religious freedom and the Council of Basle. The violent act of Eugenius in deposing the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves had awakened the fears and the resentment of many among the haughty Prelates of Germany, and had excited high indignation in the German mind. But Æneas knew his own strength, and the weakness of the Emperor. Frederick determined, or rather imagined that he acted on his own determination, to enter into negotiations. And now again who so fit to conduct those negotiations as his faithful Secretary? who but an Italian, so intimately acquainted with the interests of Germany, so attached to the Emperor, so able, so eloquent, could cope with the Prelates and Cardinals of Rome?[q] Æneas was more true to his Imperial than he had been to his Papal patron; being true to the Emperor he was true to himself. A.D. 1445.

Æneas arrived at his native Sienna. His kindred, proud no doubt of his position, crowded round him. They entreated him not to venture to Rome. Eugenius was cruel, unforgetful of injuries, bound by neither pity nor conscience.[r] A man so deeply committed in the affairs of the hostile Council might expect the worst. Æneas boldly answered that the ambassador of the Emperor of Germany must be safe everywhere. He did not betray a more important secret, that already he had obtained through two friendly Cardinals, Carvajal and Landriano, pardon for all that he had done at Basle. Æneas in Italy.

He entered Rome: he was admitted to the presence of

[q] To this visit to Rome belong the observations he makes in a letter to his patron the Bishop of Passau. Epist. xcviii. The Cardinals, he says, are by no means so rich as of old.

[r] Aiebant Eugenium crudelem, injuriarum memorem, nullâ pietate, nullâ conscientiâ teneri.—Apud Fea, p. 88.

the Pope, beside whom stood the two friendly Cardinals. He was permitted to kiss the foot, the cheek of the Pontiff. His credentials were in his hand. He was commanded to declare the object of his mission. "Ere I fulfill the orders of the Emperor, allow me, most holy Pontiff, a few words on myself. I know that many things have been brought to the ears of your Holiness concerning me, things not to my credit, and on which it were better not to dwell: neither have my accusers spoken falsely. At Basle I have written much, spoken much, done much; but my design was not to injure you, I sought only the advantage of the Catholic Church. I have erred, who will deny it, but with neither few nor undistinguished men: Julian, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, the Archbishop of Palermo, Pontanus the Protonotary of your Court, men esteemed in the eyes of the law, masters of all truth. I speak not of the Universities and Schools throughout the world, almost all adverse to your cause. With such authorities who had not erred? I must confess, that so soon as I detected the errors of those at Basle, I did not, as most others did, fly to you. But fearing to fall from error to error, from Scylla to Charybdis, I would not without consultation and delay rush from one extreme to the other. I sided with those called neutrals. I remained three years with the Emperor, heard the discussions between your Legates and those of Basle, nor could longer doubt that the truth was on your side; not unwillingly therefore I accepted this embassy from the Emperor, hoping thereby, through your clemency to be restored to your favour. I am in your hands: I have sinned in ignorance, I implore pardon. And now to the affairs of the Emperor."[s] The Pope, no doubt well prepared for this address, had his answer ready. The Ambassador of the Emperor, a man of the ability and importance of Æneas, was not to be repelled even by the stubborn Eugenius. "We know that you have erred, with many others; we cannot deny pardon to one who confesses his errors. Our holy Mother, the Church, withholds mercy from those only who refuse to acknowledge

At Rome.

[s] Commentar. Nov. p. 11.

their sins. You are now in possession of the truth, look that you do not abandon it. Show forth the divine grace in your good works. You are in a position to defend the truth, to do good service to the Church. We shall forget all the wrongs committed against us; him that walketh uprightly we shall love!" Of the Cardinals, only the virtuous Thomas of Sarzana, afterwards Nicolas V., looked coldly on the renegade, and Æneas as haughtily refused to humiliate himself. "Oh, ignorance of man," writes Æneas, "had I known that he would be Pope, what would I not have borne!"[t] But Æneas fell ill, and Thomas of Sarzana sent a common friend to console him, and to offer aid for the payment of his physicians. John Carvajal, the Pope's Legate in Germany, visited him every day. He recovered, returned to Sienna, saw his father for the last time, and went back to Germany. He was followed by a message from the Pope, appointing him his Secretary, "Wonderful and unparalleled grace of God". (so writes his biographer, probably Æneas himself), "that one man should be Secretary to two Popes" (he was continued in the office by Nicolas V.), "to an Emperor and an Antipope."[u] Æneas humbly ascribes the glory to God, as if his own craft and tergiversations had no share in the marvel.

Germany began slowly to feel and to betray the influence of the wily Italian. He ruled the irresolute Emperor. Yet even now affairs looked only more menacing and dangerous to Pope Eugenius. After due deliberation he had peremptorily refused the Emperor's demand to convoke another Council in Germany. Not only were the two Archbishop Electors under sentence of deposition, new Electors[x] had been named on his sole authority; not even Germans, but near relatives of the powerful Philip

[t] Si scisset Æneas futurum Papam, omnia tolerâsset. Fea, p. 89.

[u] So too in Epist. clxxxviii. p. 760. Apud tres Episcopos et totidem Cardinales dictandarum Epistolarum officium exercui. Ili tres quoque Pontifices maximi secretariorum collegio me ascripserunt, Eugenius, Nicolaus, Felix, quamvis hunc adulterum dixerit. Apud Cæsarem non secretarius modo, sed consiliarius et principatus honore auctus sum. Neque ego ista fortunæ imputo, quamvis nescio causam, sed ipsius rectori et dominatori omnium Deo. Thus writes Æneas in his own person.

[x] They were Bishop John of Cambray, Philip's natural brother, to Treves; to Cologne, Prince Adolph of Cleves, his sister's son. See Schmidt, vii. 18, p. 338.

of Burgundy, sworn to place them on their thrones. Six of the Electors entered into a solemn League, A.D. 1446. that if Eugenius did not immediately annul his bull of deposal against the Archbishops, limit the ecclesiastical burthens on the Empire, and submit to the decree of Constance, which asserted the supremacy of General Councils, they would cast aside their long neutrality, and acknowledge the Council of Basle, and Pope Felix V.[y] They sent an embassy to communicate this secret covenant to the Emperor and to six only of his Privy Councillors, and to demand his adhesion to the League. The Emperor admitted the justice of their demands as to the rehabilitation of the deposed Prelates, but refused to join the League, "it was impious to compel the Pope to terms by threatening to revolt from his authority."[z] The Emperor not sworn to secrecy, confided the whole to Æneas, by him at his discretion to be communicated to Rome. Æneas was ordered again to Rome to persuade the Pope to cede the restitution of the Archbishops.

He went round it seems by Frankfort, where the Electors held or were about to hold their diet. At Frankfort he found, perhaps it was his object there, the Papal Legates, Thomas of Sarzana (Bishop of Bologna), and John Carvajal. They were in dire perplexity. One must hasten to Rome for further instructions, Carvajal was ill, Æneas set off in the company of Thomas of Sarzana. It was spring, the bridges were broken down. They crossed the Alps in three days by paths only known to mountain guides over precipices and glaciers.

At Rome the Pope took the counsel of Thomas of Sarzana. Before he admitted the Ambassadors of the Electors, he had a private interview with Æneas Sylvius. Æneas at his last visit had brought himself, he now brought the Emperor to the feet of Eugenius. The only concession urged on the Pope was the revocation of the fatal step, and the restoration of the deposed Electors. The Emperor could not endure French Electors. For once

[y] Apud Guden. iv. 290; Schmidt, p 339.

[z] There is some slight discrepancy here between the Commentaries and the history.

the obstinate Eugenius bowed himself to the wiser yielding policy; Æneas had imparted his own pliancy to the Pope. There was but one difficulty, how to appease Philip Duke of Burgundy, who might resent the dismissal of his kindred, his nephew and natural brother, the intruded Archbishops of Cologne and Treves. The Papalists had tempted, flattered, bribed the pride and ambition of one of the proudest and most ambitious of men; they must allay that pride and ambition. Thomas of Sarzana was entrusted with this delicate mission: Æneas was to return to Germany, to manage the Emperor and the Empire. The Pope then admitted the Ambassadors of the six Electors. At the head of these was Gregory of Heimburg, a bold, free-spoken, fearless man, the most learned lawyer in the Empire, but described by Sylvius as of coarse manners; a genuine German of his age unfavourably contrasted in his own judgement with the supple Siennese. Heimburg's address to the Pope was intrepid, haughty: "Germany was united; it was embittered by the deposition of the Bishops—the Princes were resolved to assert the authority of General Councils." The Pope's answer was cold and brief. He had deposed the Archbishops for good reasons: he had never shown disrespect to Councils, but had maintained the dignity of the Apostolic See. He would prepare a written reply. He detained them in Rome in sullen indignation at their delay in the hot ungenial city.[a]

Æneas set forth on his return with Thomas of Sarzana. They travelled together, though Æneas was suffering from the stone, by Sienna, Pistoia, Lucca. Æneas entered Florence, the Bishop of Bologna was not allowed to do so.

[a] Hic orationem arrogantiæ plenam habuit; dixit Germaniæ principes unitos esse eadem velle et sapere, depositionem Episcoporum amarulento tulisse animo, petere ut cassetur annulleturque, ut auctoritas conciliorum approbetur, ut nationi opportunè concedatur. . . . . Eugenius ad hæc suo more pauca et graviter respondit. Hist. Freder. III. apud Kollar. p. 123. See the curious account of Gregory's behaviour. Interea legati Electorum affecti tædio murmurabant, neque sine timore fuerunt quod nimis rigidè se locutos sentiebant. Gregorius juxta Montem Jordunum post vesperas deambulare, caloribus exæstuans, quasi et Romanos et officium suum contemneret, dimissis in terram caligis, aperto pectore, nudo capite, brachia disoperiens, fastibundus incedebat, Romanosque et Eugenium et Curiam blasphemabat, multaque in calores terræ ingerebat mala. Est enim aër Romanus Theutonicis infestissimus . . . quia plus sanguinis habent quam Italici, et plus merum ebibunt, plus calore cruciantur. Ibid. 124.

Æneas was obliged to leave the Bishop ill at Parma. He hastened by Mantua, Verona, Trent, Memmingen, Ulm.[b] At Ulm he was stopped by fear of robbers, who infested the whole road to Frankfort. He fell in with the Bishops of Augsburg and Chiemsee, and the Chancellor Gaspar; with them he reached Frankfort in safety.

At Frankfort the Diet had met in imposing fullness. Sept. 1, 1446. Diet at Frankfort. The Emperor was represented by the Chancellor, the Bishops of Augsburg and Chiemsee, the Marquises of Baden and Brandenburg, and by Æneas Sylvius. The Electors were all present. The Pope's Legates were John de Carvajal and Nicolas de Cusa. Thomas of Sarzana did not arrive till he had successfully fulfilled his mission to the Duke of Burgundy. Louis, Cardinal of Arles, John de Lysura and others appeared for the Council of Basle and the Antipope. Louis of Arles claimed to have the cross borne before him, and to celebrate the first mass before the Diet as Papal Legate. His claim was supported by the Electors, fully determined to maintain the rights of the Council. The Emperor's Ambassadors remonstrated; Germany was yet pledged to strict neutrality. The citizens of Frankfort were on that side; they had sworn allegiance to the Emperor not to the Electors; the Cardinal of Arles was forced ungraciously to submit.

The session was opened by Gregory of Heimburg, who reported the reception of his mission at Rome. Altercation. He described the Court of Rome as implacably hostile to Germany; Eugenius as harsh, haughty, repulsive. The Cardinals he turned to ridicule, especially "the bearded old goat," the Cardinal Bessarion. Æneas replied, rebuking the unfairness of the German, and labouring to bring out the milder and more courteous points in the demeanour and language of the Pope. Æneas had to encounter some unpleasant altercation. The Cardinal of Arles reproached him with his tergiversations. "It is not I," answered Æneas, "who have changed but the Council, they once offered to remove the Council from Basle, now they refuse; as if all truth were contained within the walls of Basle."

[b] Comment. 94. Compared with other documents.

John de Lysura was even more pointed and personal. "Are you come from Sienna to legislate for Germany? You had better have stayed at home and left us to settle our own affairs." Æneas kept prudent silence.

The reports from Rome had made a deep and unfavourable impression. Basle appeared to triumph; the Electors seemed determined to declare for the Council and for Felix V. But the resources of Æneas were not exhausted; he boldly summoned to his aid two irresistible allies—in plain language, bribery, and forgery. All things, Æneas had said in his Anti-papal days, are venal with the Court of Rome; the imposition of hands, the gifts of the Holy Ghost are openly sold.[c] Rome could buy as well as sell; and the severe virtue of Germany was not proof against pontifical gold. No less a person than the Archbishop of Mentz sold himself to Eugenius; meaner men could not hesitate with such an example. The Archbishop did not actually take the money with his own hands, but two thousand Rhenish Florins were distributed among his four chief Counsellors.[d]

Danger and conduct of Æneas.

But the Archbishop Elector would maintain decency. He could not veer round without some specious excuse. Æneas boldly took in hand the Ambassadors' instructions; he dressed them up, quietly discarding every hard or offensive word, insinuating milder and more conciliatory expressions; and with deliberate effrontery presented these notes, as authorised by Pope Eugenius.[e] He ran the risk of being disclaimed by the stubborn Pontiff, and exposed as the Forger of official documents. The notes declared the assent of the Pope to the restora-

Bribery and forgery.

[c] Nihil est quod absque argento Romana Curia dedit. Nam et ipsæ manus impositiones, et Spiritûs Sancti dona venumdantur. Epist. lxvi.

[d] Cumque res diu inutiliter tractaretur, ad pecuniam tandem recurrere oportet, cui raræ non obaudiunt aures, hæc domina curiarum est, hæc aures omnium aperit: huic omnia serviunt: hæc quoque *Moguntinum expugnavit*. These are the words of Æneas Sylvius himself in his Hist. Frederic. III. published by Kollar, vol. ii. p. 127. The Emperor advanced the money; it was afterwards paid by Nicolas V. Compare also Fea, p. 100.

[e] Cum Legati Cæsaris non possent mienti Pontificis satisfacere, Æneas modum commentus est, qui, receptis notulis, secundum quas se Principes obligaverant, nisi Eugenius illas admitteret velle se eum deserere, omne venenum ex eis ademit, *novasque notulas composuit*, per quas et Archiepiscopi deprivati restituerentur, et nationi opportunè provideretur et auctoritas Conciliorum salvaretur, illasque dixit sua opinione Eugenium non negaturum.—Vit. Fred. III. p. 129.

tion of the deposed Archbishops, vaguely recognised the independence of the German nation, saved the authority of General Councils. Æneas had calculated with his usual sagacity. These notes were accepted, and presented to the Diet, signed by the Elector of Mentz, the Marquis of Brandenburg, the Grand Master of Prussia, the Archbishops of Saltzburg and Magdeburg, and many other Princes. The Elector of Treves and the Duke of Saxony alone opposed; the Elector Palatine wavered. The Electoral League was paralyzed, a new League formed between the Emperor, the Electors of Mentz, Brandenburg, and the rest. The Diet broke up, the three Electors departed in indignation; the Ambassadors of Basle in sorrow and discomfiture.

Æneas and Procopius Rabensteyn, a Bohemian Noble, were despatched to Rome as Imperial Ambassadors to obtain the Pope's assent to the terms thus framed. On his assent the Emperor and most of the German Princes would forswear their neutrality and acknowledge him for Pope. Letters had been previously sent; the College of Cardinals was divided; the more rigid theologians would admit no concession. Pope Eugenius was advised to create four new Cardinals, the Archbishop of Milan, the Abbot of St. Paul, Thomas of Sarzana Bishop of Bologna, John Carvajal. At Sienna the Imperial Ambassadors encountered others from the Archbishop of Mentz and the German Princes. The representative of Mentz was no less than John of Lysura, but a few days before so stern a Basilian, who had been so offended by the apostacy of Æneas, and had now trimmed his sails to the wind.

They were received with joyous welcome as bringing the submission of Germany to the Papal See.[f] The third day they were introduced into the private consistory. Æneas spoke; all heard with rapture. No voice was silent in his praise! That very day the Pope was seized with mortal sickness. The physicians said that he could not live ten days. Would he live long enough to ratify the Treaty? The Ambassadors were only commissioned to

[f] Erat enim ingens gaudium prope sexdecim annos Germaniam perditam recuperasse. Fea, p. 105.

Eugenius: delay might be fatal, a new schism might arise. "If" (said John of Lysura), "the little toe of his left foot is alive, it is enough." The Pope not only lived to issue the Apostolic Bulls, but to reward the invaluable services of Æneas Sylvius. A vacancy in the Bishopric of Trieste was announced, the Pope at once appointed Æneas to the See. The rejoicings at Rome were like those at a great victory, bonfires blazed, the city was illuminated, the noise of trumpets, the pealing of bells rang through the streets. After fourteen days died Pope Eugenius; his stubborn pertinacity might seem to have won a glorious triumph: he had deluded the Germans by some specious concessions, of which he himself well knew the hollow value (the Apostolic Bulls were called Concordats); he had almost reconquered the allegiance of Christendom. But he is said to have exclaimed on his death-bed, "Oh Gabriel, better had it been for your soul, if you had never been Cardinal, never Pope, but continued to practise the religious discipline of your monastery!"[8] The Pope was dead, the Monk still lived. Feb. 23, 1447.

[8] Palatii Gesta Pontificum apud Weissenberg, p. 465. The character of Eugenius changes in the writings of Æneas with the changes in Æneas himself. We have seen some illustrations of this. In the Hist. Concil. Basil. "Eugenius is a reed shaken by the wind" (no very apt similitude), an object of dislike, even of contempt. In his Dialogue de Auctor. Concilii, alluded to in his Retractation, his praise of Felix passes into adulation. There is no grace or virtue which is not heaped upon him. In Eugenius the defiance darkens into vituperation: "Vexator ecclesiæ, non solum laude indignus, sed detestatione et execratione totius humani generis dignus procul dubio est." So says one of the interlocutors, unrebuked by Æneas. Compare on the other side the high character in the de Europa, p. 458. So too in Vit. Frederic. III. p. 135. Fuit autem Eugenius alti animi, injuriarum tenax, delatoribus aurem præbuit, avaritiam calcavit, honoris cupidus fuit: ubi sententiam imbuit, non facile mutari potuit: religiosis viris admodum favit. In another passage — alti cordis fuit, sed nullum in eo vitium fuit, nisi quia sine mensurâ erat, et non quod potuit, sed quod voluit, aggressus est. This heightens our opinion of the boldness and sagacity of Æneas in persuading such a man to accept as his own, instructions which he had not given.

CHAPTER XVII.

NICOLAS V.

The Pontificate of Nicolas V. is the culminating point of Latin Christianity. The Papal power indeed had long reached its zenith. From Innocent III. to Boniface VIII. it had begun its decline. But Latin Christianity was alike the religion of the Popes and of the Councils which contested their supremacy. It was as yet no more than a sacerdotal strife whether the Pope should maintain an irresponsible autocracy, or be limited and controlled by an ubiquitous aristocratic Senate. The most ardent reformers looked no further than to strengthen the Hierarchy. The Prelates were determined to emancipate themselves from the usurpations of the Pope, as to their elections, their arbitrary taxation by Rome, the undermining of their authority by perpetual appeals; but they had no notion of relaxing in the least the ecclesiastical domination. It was not that Christendom might govern itself, but that themselves might have a more equal share in the government. They were as jealously attached as the Pope to the creed of Latin Christianity. The Council, not the Pope, burned John Huss. Their concessions to the Bohemians were extorted from their fears, not granted by their liberality. Gerson, D'Ailly, Louis of Arles, Thomas of Corcelles, were as rigid theologians as Martin V. or Eugenius IV. The Vulgate was their Bible, the Latin service their exclusive liturgy, the Canon Law their code of jurisprudence.

Latin Christianity had yet to discharge some part of its mission. It had to enlighten the world with letters, to adorn it with arts. It had hospitably to receive (a gift fatal in the end to its own dominion) and to promulgate to mankind the poets, historians, philosophers of

Greece. It had to break down its own idols, the Schoolmen, and substitute a new idolatry, that of Classical Literature. It had to perfect Christian art. Already Christian Architecture had achieved some of its wonders. The venerable Lateran and St. Paul's without the Walls, the old St. Peter's, St. Mark's at Venice and Pisa, Strasburg and Cologne, Rheims and Bourges, York and Lincoln, stood in their majesty. Christian Painting, and even Christian Sculpture, were to rise to their untranscended excellence.

The choice of Nicolas V. was one of such singular felicity for his time that it cannot be wondered if his admirers looked on it as overruled by the Holy Spirit. "Who would have thought in Florence," so said Nicolas to his biographer Vespasiano, "that a priest who rang the bells should become Supreme Pontiff?"[a] Yet it seems to have been a happy accident. Eighteen Cardinals met in the Conclave. Ten voices were for the Cardinal Colonna; two more would give him the requisite majority. Alfonso, King of Arragon and Sicily, encamped at Tivoli, favoured the Colonna. Already, to end the strife, the Cardinal of Bologna had risen to add his suffrage. He was checked and interrupted by the wise Cardinal of Tarento. "Whom, then," said he, "do you nominate?" "The Cardinal of Bologna!" A sudden light seemed to flash on the Conclave: Thomas of Sarzana, Cardinal of Bologna, was Pope.[b] Nicolas V.

Had a turbulent, punctilious, obstinate Pope, another Eugenius, succeeded Eugenius IV., all might again have been strife and confusion. The consummate diplomatic skill of Æneas Sylvius had extorted some concessions on his deathbed even from that impracticable Pope. Some questions had been designedly left in decent vagueness.

The Cardinal of Bologna was forty-eight years old. His rise to honours had been rapid—Bishop, Cardinal, Pope, in three successive years.[c] He was known as a lover and liberal patron of letters. As Legate he had been singularly active, conciliatory, popular, and therefore

[a] Apud Muratori, p. 279. [b] Vit. Nicolai V., a Dominico Georgio, p. 4.
[c] 1445, 1446, 1447.

successful. He had seemingly personal friendship for Æneas Sylvius, and could fully appreciate his wise and dexterous management. He left the German negotiations in those able hands; but a speech attributed to him was well-timed. "The Bishops had too little, rather than too much power: he had no design to encroach on their lawful authority."[d] This is more remarkable, as in all business he had the most perfect self-confidence: nothing was well done which he did not do himself.[e]

Dissolution of Council of Basle. A.D. 1449.

Two years had hardly elapsed when Nicolas V. (so well had Æneas Sylvius done his work in Germany) was sole and undisputed Pope. The Council of Basle, disowned, almost forgotten, had dissolved itself. Felix V. was again Amadeus of Savoy, in his peaceful retreat at Ripaille. The Council had the wisdom to yield, the Pope the greater wisdom to admit the Council to an honourable capitulation. The Fathers at Basle appeared to submit to the friendly urgency of the Kings of France and England. They maintained prudent silence on the abandonment of their cause by the Emperor Frederick III. and his as yet ambiguous and disguised menaces of compulsory dissolution. The Prince-Pope was permitted to retire, not without dignity. Nicolas demanded not that insulting humiliation which had been enforced by his predecessors on their discomfited rivals. Felix V. sank into a Cardinalate, and that Cardinalate next in honour to the Pope. Louis of Arles was restored to his rank. Three out of the Cardinals named by Felix were advanced by Nicolas; the rest were dead or content to abdicate. All the Papal censures against the Pope and the Council were annulled; the Acts of the Council, as far as promotions and appointments, confirmed.

Abdication of Felix.

So ended the last Antipope,[f] so closed the last Council which claimed co-equal authority with the Pope. The

[d] Weissenberg.

[e] See the elaborate character of Nicolas V. by Æneas Sylvius.—Fea, p. 139. He was hasty, but placable; friendly, but there was no friend with whom he was not at some time angry. "Nimium de se credidit, omnia per se facere voluit. Nihil bene fieri putavit, nisi interesset. Injuriarum neque ultor, neque oblitus est."

[f] Amadeus lived only to Jan. 1, 1451, Muratori, sub ann. 1449.

peaceful treaty showed a great advance in Christian courtesy, in Christian forbearance, in the majesty of Christian gentleness; but some decay too in the depth and ardour of Christian zeal. To have been an Antipope was no longer an odious and inexpiable crime—a crime to be forgiven only after the most contumelious abasement, or as an ostentatious act of mercy. Felix may have owed something to his princely rank, more to the times and to the sagacious character of Nicolas V. Basle saw the last Council which could pretend to the title of Œcumenic: that of Trent was a Council of Papal Christendom, and by no means the whole of Papal Christendom. All that had severed itself from Latin Christianity, part which was still in union, stood aloof from an assembly chiefly gathered from two nations, Spain and Italy.

Nicolas V. retired into his serene and peaceful dignity: not so his restless colleague in all his negotiations and in his journeys. Æneas Sylvius had still years of busy life before him. Among the first acts of Pope Nicolas had been the confirmation of Æneas in his Papal Secretaryship and in his Bishopric of Trieste. It was singular enough that, as Bishop of Bologna, Thomas of Sarzana had been honoured everywhere but in his own See. Bologna would not admit him within her walls. The Church of Trieste, at first refractory, could not but receive a Bishop commended by the Emperor and the Pope. Æneas Sylvius.

The Bishop of Trieste returned to Germany. No affair of Frederick III. could be conducted without his aid. He was first sent to the Diet of Aschaffenburg, which, under the Archbishop of Mentz, accepted the Bulls of Pope Eugenius and acknowledged Pope Nicolas. Duke Philippo Maria, the last of the Viscontis, died,[g] Milan was in confusion.[h] The Emperor, among the competitors for the Dukedom,[i] as an escheated fief of the Empire,

[g] In the castle of Porta Zobbia, Aug. 15, 1447.

[h] "Incredibile allora fu la revoluzione dello Stato de Milano; tutto si riempi di sedizioni, ed ognuno prese l'armi."—Muratori, sub ann.

[i] Charles, Duke of Orleans, in right of his mother, Valentina, sister of the late Duke; Alfonso, King of Naples and Arragon, by the will of the late Duke; Francis Sforza, husband of the natural daughter of the late Duke.

would beyond that, put in his claim as actual Ruler. Æneas was among his ambassadors. Milan would own the suzerainty of the Emperor, but at the same time maintain her freedom. The Embassy returned, having effected nothing, from the impracticable city.[k] Æneas attributes their failure to the grasping ambition of his German colleagues in the Embassy: demanding too much, they lost all; his more subtle policy would have succeeded better. He returned to Vienna, was consecrated Bishop of Trieste, visited his diocese, was received with cordial welcome, and celebrated mass. But he was not long occupied with his peaceful duties. He was called upon to settle a question of frontier in Istria between the Emperor and the Venetians. On his return to Trieste he found a Count Rupert warring on the city, wasting the estates of the Church. He laid his complaints before the Emperor, but himself hardly escaped from the hands of the noble freebooter. On his return to Vienna he found his power at the Council somewhat in danger. His friend and patron Gaspar Schlick was in disgrace. As of the Chancellor's faction Æneas fell under suspicion. With his usual dexterity he steered his course, not absolutely renouncing his friend, yet not offending the Emperor. He received another benefice, a rich parish church in the neighbourhood of Vienna.

Milan again besieged by Francis Sforza made overtures to the Emperor. Again the indefatigable Æneas crossed the Worm Alp, descended into the Valteline, and found the Lake of Como and its shores overrun by the troops of Sforza; he reached Como with difficulty. That city was beset on all sides; Sforza eagerly desired to seize the Imperial Ambassadors. At the head of a few soldiers, Æneas dashed through by night and reached Milan.[m] Notwithstanding the open and the secret opposition of Sforza's partisans, he assembled and harangued the people. Three gates (quarters) of the city would have proclaimed the Emperor without condition, one more had been a majority.[n] Terms were however framed, on the whole

[k] Commentar. Pii II., &c., pp. 19, 25.
[m] Vit. Frederic. III., p. 147.
[n] Ibid., p. 149.

favourable to the Emperor, but such as Æneas had no authority to accept. Charles Gonzaga proposed to Æneas to seize the city by force. This Æneas declined as unbecoming his ecclesiastical character. The scheme was full of dangers, and of very doubtful issue! Æneas returned to the Emperor; but Frederick needed not only dexterous Ambassadors, but well appointed armies and able Generals to occupy and protect Milan: he had neither. Milan opened her gates to Sforza; Sforza was Duke of Milan.[o] From Feb. 26 to March 22, 1450.

In the first year of Sforza's dukedom, that of the Jubilee, Æneas was engaged on a more peaceful mission, to settle the contract of marriage between the Emperor and Leonora, sister of the King of Portugal. The agreement was readily made at Naples with the Ambassadors of Portugal. Æneas saw Rome at the height of the Jubilee, his friend and Patron, Nicolas V., receiving the homage, the well-deserved homage, and the tribute of the world.

In Nicolas V., in three short years, the Pope had become again a great Italian Potentate. Not that Nicolas V. was of one of the famous houses, or aspired to found a family of Princes. He was superior to, or not tempted to that Nepotism, which had already made some advances, some initiatory efforts, to invest the descendants or kinsmen of Popes in territorial honours or titles. Hitherto these families had taken no root, had died out, sunk into obscurity, or had been beaten down by common consent as upstart usurpers. Nicolas V. laid the foundation of his power, not so much in the strength of the Roman See as a temporal Sovereignty, as in the admiration and gratitude of Italy, which was rapidly reported over the whole of Christendom. He kept in pay no large armies, his Cardinals were not Condottieri generals; he declared that he would never employ any arms but those of the Cross of Christ.[p] But he maintained the Estates of the Church in peace, he endeavoured (and the circumstances of the

[o] "Qui etiam insignia ducalia, tradente populo, suscepit, quæ res neque vim neque colorem habuit justitiæ."—P. 162. Muratori, sub ann. i. 450. For the personal adventures of Æneas Sylvius, see the Commentaries and Life of Frederick III. apud Kollar, p. 140, *et seq.*

[p] Vespasiano, p. 279.

times favoured that better policy) to compose the feuds of Italy, raging at least with their usual violence. He was among the few Popes, really a great Pacificator in Italy. Four mighty Powers were now mingled in open war, or in secret intrigue. Alfonso, King of Arragon and the two Sicilies, the Dukes of Milan, the Venetians and the Florentines. Eugenius had had the wisdom, or good fortune, to abandon the French pretensions to the throne of Naples, that fatal claim by which the Popes had for centuries entailed the miseries of war upon Italy, and servitude upon themselves. The strife for the Dukedom of Milan, notwithstanding the pretensions of the Emperor, and all the arts of Æneas Sylvius, the claims of the King of Arragon, and of the House of Orleans, had terminated in the establishment of the Sforzas. Pope Nicolas almost for the first time entered openly into Italian politics, as a true Mediator—not as a partisan—and, so doing, was for the first time (to a certain extent at least) successful in his mediation. Even in the wars of these powers Romagna was respected and escaped devastation. The warlike chieftains who had usurped the cities and domains of the Church, were glad to become her subjects. The Malatestas accepted the recognition of their title as Lords of Rimini, Fano, and other cities of Romagna, and from their tribute the Pope received a revenue, if not equal in amount, more sure and less invidious than his own taxation. The retrenchments insisted upon by the Council of Basle, were eluded by a Concordat, drawn with all the subtlety of Æneas Sylvius, and received by his obsequious master Frederick. In remote regions there were still deep murmurs at the avarice, the venality of Rome; Nicolas and his Court escaped not, and did not deserve to escape, the common charge of rapacity; but such murmurs died away in those distant quarters, or had lost their effect.[q]

All this was not done, but it was well begun before the

[q] Stimmen, p. 115. The ambassador, credited with 1225 ducats, is instructed to give 1000 ducats either in gold or in some rich present—225 are for the Cardinal patron. But if the Pope is not content with the 1000, he must have it all, and the Protector wait. The close of the affair is even more discreditable to the Pope. It is a very curious detail on the process of Papal bribery. In 1449, a collector and vendor of Indulgences levied in Prussia 7845 marks: for Indulgences, 3241; for Peter's Pence, 4604.—P. 137.

Jubilee; and no Jubilee had been more splendid, more peaceful, attended by greater numbers,[r] productive of more immense wealth.[s] A new coin for the Jubilee was struck. From every part of Europe came pilgrims of the highest rank, strangers swarmed like ants in the streets of Rome and Florence. The throng was so great that above 200 persons were crushed to death on the bridge of St. Angelo.[t] The Bank of the Medici alone had 100,000 florins belonging to the Church,[u] and during the whole time poured in riches, which aided in the restoration of the dilapidated finances of the Popedom. The Pilgrims carried back throughout Europe accounts of the resuscitated majesty of the Roman Pontificate, the unsullied personal dignity of the Pope, the reinthronement of religion in the splendid edifices, which were either building or under restoration.[x]

Among those who would disseminate the fame of Nicolas V., none would be more loud, as none had stronger reasons to be grateful, than Æneas Sylvius. He had just reached the Alps on his return from Rome (he had hardly escaped drowning in a swollen stream), when he was overtaken by the pleasant intelligence that he had been named by the Pope, Bishop of his native city of Sienna. Æneas had never contemplated the passing the rest of his life in the cold ungenial region of Germany. "I yearn," he writes, "for my native Italy; I dread nothing so much as to lay my bones in a foreign land, though the way to

[r] "Dopo il primo Giubileo del Anno 1300 forse non fu mai veduto un si gran flusso e riflusso di gente in Roma, de modo che le strade Maestre d'Italia pareano tante Fiere."—Muratori Ann., sub ann. "Licet quadrigenta et amplius millia diebus singulis per urbem templa foraque vaderent."—Vit. Freder. III., p. 172.

[s] The Teutonic Order tried to suppress the Bull, and to discourage the wasteful journey to Rome. The Pope was furious, and only appeased by a great offering.—Stimmen, p. 140.

[t] Infessura, Chron. de Rimini; Æneas Sylvius, Vit. Frederic. p. 172.

[u] Vespasiano, Vit. Nicol. V.

[x] The Jubilee was interrupted by the plague, the fear of which had driven many in devotion to Rome (Sanuto says 60,000 died in Milan; hardly a man was left alive in Piacenza).—Muratori. The Cardinals, the Pope himself, were obliged to fly from Rome. "His Holiness goes from one castle to another with a small Court, and very few followers, seeking to find anywhere an uninfected place. His Holiness is now in a castle called Fabriano, where he was last year for some time; and it is said has forbidden, under pain of death, that any one, of any rank whatever, who is at Rome, shall come secretly or openly to Fabriano, or within seven miles of it: the Cardinals alone are excepted, who are limited to four servants."—Voigt, from the Despatches of the Teutonic Knights. Stimmen, p. 70. This is not a very high view of the Pope's courage.

heaven or to hell lies open alike from both. But it would be less painful, I know not why, to die in the arms of brothers, sisters, sons, grandsons."[y] It should seem[z] that he turned back, saw the Pope again, entered Sienna, was welcomed with the joyful acclamations of the inhabitants, proud to receive a native Siennese as their Bishop. But the Bishop of Sienna returned to his Imperial Master: Germany must still be held in its close alliance with Rome. His next embassy, in the following year, was into Bohemia. Both on his journey towards Prague and on his return, he was hospitably received in Tabor, the city of the most extreme disciples of John Huss. In a letter to John Carvajal,[a] the Cardinal of St. Angelo,* he gives a striking description of that inexpugnable fortress. Over the gates were two shields, on one was painted an Angel with the Sacramental Cup, on the other the blind old Ziska, their leader in war while alive, whose skin, stretched on a drum, after his death, had inspirited them to certain victory. The Bishop of Sienna had strong misgivings in entering this head-quarters of Satan. The Churchman held the audacious sectaries, who disdained the Primacy of Rome (the head of their offending, which included all other heresies) in the devoutest horror. "The Emperor Sigismund, instead of granting terms of peace to this most wicked and sacrilegious race, ought to have exterminated them, or reduced them to hewers of stone for the rest of mankind." Æneas had forgotten the irresistible valour, the splendid years of victory, which had extorted these terms from the Emperor. But the rude, poor Taborites treated the Bishop with perfect courtesy. At a town about twenty-five miles from Prague (a pestilence was raging in Prague, and to his regret he dared not approach that ancient and noble city), he met the heads of the Bohemian nation. The object of his mission was soon despatched; the summons of a general Convention in the following year, with the Ambassador of the Emperor, and the Pope's Legate, at Leutmeritz. In that city he held a long theological discussion with George Podiebrad; a second at Tabor with Nicolas, the Bishop of the

[y] Epist. lxv. [z] The account is not clear. [a] Epist. cxxx.

sect. He acknowledged that all his eloquence made no impression on the stubborn Utraquists. The Taborites stuck to the Scripture, Æneas to the power of the Church; no wonder that they came to no conclusion. But whatever might be the secret thoughts of each party, as to the fate of his antagonist on the Day of Judgement, they parted with seeming mutual respect.

Nicolas V. was to behold, as it were, the final act of homage to the Popedom, from the majesty of the Empire. He was to be the last Pontiff who was to crown at Rome the successor of Charlemagne; Frederick III. the last Emperor who was so to receive his crown from the hands of the Pope. Æneas Sylvius is again in Italy; he is the harbinger of the Emperor, who is about to descend into Italy to meet his Portuguese bride, to consummate his marriage, and at the same time to celebrate his Coronation at Rome. The Free cities were always troubled, and were thrown into a tumult of intrigue, if not of feud, by the appearance of the Emperor in Italy. Guelph turned pale, Ghibelline brightened. Sienna was under popular government. Would the Emperor's favourite, the favourite of the Pope, the heir of the proud but fallen house of Piccolomini, now their Bishop, forego the opportunity of seizing for his own family the lordship of the city? [b] Sienna, which the year before had thronged out to meet Æneas, received him in sullen silence; no one visited him, his name was heard muttered with low curses in the streets. Æneas, as he says, smiled at the sudden change (did not his vanity magnify his own unpopularity, and the jealousy of the city?). He assembled the Senate, assured them of the peaceful and unambitious views of himself, his family, and of the Emperor. The Siennese suppressed, but could not conceal their mistrust. Æneas having splendidly buried his colleague in the Embassy, who died at Sienna, thought it most prudent to go down to Telamona, in order to be in readiness to receive the Portuguese Princess.

Coronation of the Emperor.

Pope Nicolas himself began to look with alarm at the approach of the Emperor. There were suspicious move-

[b] Vit. Frederic. III. p. 244.

ments at Rome; more than suspicions, of the dire designs of Stephen Porcaro and his partisans, which broke out during the next year.

The pride and the felicity of Nicolas V. was in the undisturbed peace of Italy, at least of Roman Italy; who could foretell what strange or unexpected tumults might arise at the appearance of the Emperor? He sent to delay the march of Frederick, at least till the summer; he urged the want of provisions, of preparation, the dangers of a winter journey. Æneas was indignant at this timid vacillation of the Pope; "it became not the supreme Pontiff, to say one thing to-day, another to-morrow." He assured Pope Nicolas of the pacific intentions of the Emperor. He appealed to the conduct of the Emperor to the Church; if he had been an enemy to the Church, the whole majesty of the Clergy had been crushed; we had not had the joy of beholding you in your present state of power and authority.[c] He wrote courteous letters to urge the immediate descent of Frederick.[d]

Tumults in Austria detained the Emperor; stormy weather his bride. Æneas Sylvius spent sixty weary days at Telamona.[e] At length, on the same day, the Emperor entered Florence, his bride Leghorn. They met at Sienna. Sienna thought it well to appear to be full of joy, was delighted with the urbanity and condescension of the Emperor, renounced her suspicions of Æneas, recalled all his kindred, some of whom with other nobles, were in exile; and entreated the Bishop, whom the people now called the father of his country, to represent the City before the Pope.

The imperial cavalcade set off for Rome. As they descended the Ciminian hill, which overhangs Viterbo, the Emperor called Æneas to his side. "I shall live to see you Cardinal, I shall live to see you Pope." Æneas, with proper modesty, protested that he did not aspire to

[c] Si voluisset tantum possum ibat Ecclesia: cleri majestas omnis extinguebatur; nec tu hodie in hoc statu esses, in quo te videntes lætamur, p. 191.

[d] The most full account of this affair, with the letter of Æneas to the Pope, is in the Hist. Frederic. III. apud Kollar, pp. 187 *et seq.*

[e] He whiled away his time by visiting the old Etrurian cities in the neighbourhood. Æneas had a remarkable, almost a premature, taste for antiquities and for the beauties of nature.

either of these perilous dignities. At Rome the marriage was solemnised by the Pope himself,[f] afterwards the Coronation with great magnificence.[g] Æneas Sylvius made a speech for the Emperor. The day after, during an interview at which Æneas was present, the Emperor and the Pope communicated two extraordinary dreams.[h] The Emperor, the last time that the Cardinal of Bologna left Vienna, had dreamed that he was crowned not by a Roman, but by the Cardinal of Bologna. "It is the privilege," said the Pope, "of those set up to rule the people to have true dreams. I myself dreamed that my predecessor Eugenius, the night before his death, had arrayed me in the Pontifical dress and mitre, and placed me on the throne. Take thou my seat, I depart to St. Peter." The humble Thomas of Sarzana had not been without his ambition![i] The prediction of the Emperor, as to the advancement of Æneas Sylvius, now on such amicable terms with the Pope, might have been expected to meet its own immediate accomplishment, as far as the Cardinalate. Æneas, however, received only a barren promise, which Pope Nicolas did not live to fulfill. But he returned to Germany Papal Ambassador and Legate to Bohemia, Silesia, Austria, Moravia, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola,—afterwards, at the Emperor's request, to Hungary. The Legatine character gave him great weight, he exercised it with his accustomed sagacity, and in perfect fidelity to Frederick. He was armed, as Legate, with Papal censures against all the enemies of Frederick. But these Austrian affairs belong not to our history.

March 18, 1452.

Throughout Christendom, except in the narrow corner of Bohemia, Pope Nicolas V. ruled supreme. Yet even Nicolas V. was not secure against the inextinguishable turbulence of the Roman people. The republicanism of the Crescentii, of Arnold of Brescia, of Brancaleone, of Rienzi, of Baroncelli, had still its champions and its martyrs. Stephen Porcaro was the last heir, till very

[f] Æneas Sylvius describes the whole at great length, p. 277 *et seq.*

[g] The cautious Pope had arrayed all the militia of the city, and occupied St. Angelo and the other strongholds with an imposing force to keep the peace.

[h] Muratori, sub ann.

[i] Vita Frederic. p. 296.

modern times, of this dangerous and undying race. Stephen Porcaro was of equestrian family, of powerful and kindling eloquence. On the death of Eugenius (Eugenius himself had been driven from Rome by popular insurrection) Porcaro had urged the rising of the people, the proclamation of the Republic.[k] Pope Nicolas, anxious to conciliate all orders, appointed the dangerous demagogue on a mission in the Roman territory. On his return Porcaro renewed his agitation. He boldly avowed his opinions, and almost announced himself as defender of the liberties of the Roman people. He was sent in honourable exile to Bologna, under the sole restraint that he should present himself every day before Bessarion, the Cardinal Legate. He returned secretly to Rome. A conspiracy had been organised in which the nephew of Porcaro took the lead. Stephen Porcaro harangued the conspirators, inveighed against the tyranny of the rulers, the arbitrary proscription, the banishment, even the execution, of Roman citizens. He declared that it was ignominious that the city which had ruled the world should be subject to the dominion of priests, who were women rather than men.[m] He would cast off for ever the degrading yoke. He had at his command three hundred hired soldiers. Four hundred noble Romans were ready to appear in arms. He appealed to their cupidity as to their patriotism: to-morrow they might be in possession of a million of gold pieces.[n] If the aims of Porcaro were noble, his immediate designs, the designs with which he was charged, and with seeming truth,[o] were those of the robber, the bloody and cowardly assassin.[p] The contemplated mode of insurrection had the further horror of impious sacrilege. The Pope and

[k] Dicens omnem servitutem turpem, fœdissimam autem quæ præsbyteris præstaretur, rogabatque Romanos, dum Cardinales clausi essent, aliquod audere pro libertate. Æneas Sylvius, V. Fred. III. p. 135.

[m] Turpe esse dictitans eam urbem, quæ totum sibi subjecerit orbem, nunc sacerdotum imperio subjacere, quos rectius fœminas quam viros quisque appellaverit. Æneas Sylvius, Europa, p. 459.

[n] Zantfliet, Stephen Infessura, Platina.

[o] Vita Nicolai V. p. 128.

[p] Sismondi, true to his republican bias, raises Stephen Porcaro to a hero and a martyr; and while he perhaps exaggerates the cruelty of the Pope, hardly touches on its justification, the atrocity of the plot. When will Italian freedom forswear assassination as its first and favourite weapon?

the Cardinals were to be surprised while solemnising the mass on the festival of the Epiphany. The Papal stables near the church were to be set on fire. In the tumult Porcaro was to appear in purple and with the ensigns of magistracy, to force or gain his way as a worshipper towards the altar. The Pope was to be seized; it was said that the chains were found, chains of gold, which had been displayed to the insurgents, which were to fetter his holy person,[q] only, however, to be thrown into a dungeon as a hostage to compel his brother to surrender the Castle of St. Angelo. His after-fate was perhaps to be that of his brethren the Cardinals, who were to be massacred without mercy. The shaven crown was no longer to be an object of fear or respect in Rome.[r] The insurgents had nicely calculated the amount of plunder: from the Palace of the Pope 200,000 florins; from the Sacred College 200,000; from the merchants and public officers 200,000; from the magazines and salt depôts 200,000; from the confiscated property of the enemies of the revolution 100,000.

The conspiracy was detected or betrayed.[s] The house where the conspirators assembled was surrounded with troops. Porcaro escaped, but was found next day, hidden by his sister in a chest. Sciarra Porcaro, the nephew, cut his way through the soldiers and fled. Many servants and quantities of arms were found in the house. The very day of his capture the bodies of Stephen Porcaro and nine of his accomplices were seen hanging from the battlements of the Castle of St. Angelo. They had in vain implored confession and the last sacrament. Many other executions followed. Two Canons of St. Peter's were involved in the plot: one was found innocent and released; the other fled to Damascus, where he remained till after the death of the Pope. Large rewards were offered for some who had escaped: one thousand ducats if produced alive, five hundred if dead. Some were allowed to be seized in Padua and Venice. The Cardinal of Metz

[q] Ad colligandum ait præsulem, catenam auream secum attulit, a se jampridem paratam quam congregatis ostendit. Æn. Syl. Europa, p. 460.

[r] Velle enim aiebat se id agere, ut æternùm intra hæc mœnia capitis rasi dentes vereri non oporteret. Leo Alberti.

[s] According to Stefano Infessura they attacked one hundred of the Pope's guards, and killed the Maresciallo.

interceded for Battista Persona; it was alleged that he was guiltless. The Pope promised mercy: whether on new evidence or not, he was hung the next morning: the indignant Cardinal left Rome.

The Pope was bitterly mortified at this ingratitude of the Roman people for his mild government, the peace which they enjoyed, the wealth which had poured into the city, the magnificent embellishments of Rome. He became anxious and morose. Remorse for blood, if necessarily, too prodigally shed, would weigh heavily on a Pope who had shrunk from war as unchristian.[1] The famous architect Leo Alberti (employed, it is true, by Nicolas V. in his splendid designs for St. Peter's) describes the unexampled state of prosperity enjoyed under Nicolas, for which the conspirators would have made that cruel return. "The whole of Latium was at peace: the last thing to be expected was that any Roman could think to change the state of affairs for the better by a revolution. The domain of the Church was in a high state of cultivation; the city had become a city of gold through the Jubilee; the dignity of the citizens was respected; all reasonable petitions were granted at once by the Pontiff. There were no exactions, no new taxes. Justice was fairly administered. It was the whole care of the Pope to adorn the city." The more devout and the more wealthy were indignant at the design to plunder and massacre the foreigners whose profuse wealth enabled the Romans to live in ease and luxury; at the profanation of the Church by promiscuous slaughter, of the altar itself by blood; the total destruction of the Cardinals, the priesthood, of religion itself; the seizure of the Pope, whose feet distant potentates crowded to kiss on his sublime function of sacrifice; the dragging him forth, loaded with chains,

[1] See in Collier (i. p. 672) the curious account of Porcaro's conspiracy given in England by the Pope's Nuncio Clement Vincentio: "It was drawn," said the Nuncio, "from the brothels and profligates of Rome." The Nuncio suggests a form of public thanksgiving for the Pope's deliverance, and intimates that a letter from the English clergy would be acceptable, denouncing Rome as degenerating to the licentiousness of old Babylon, and advising the Pope to leave the wicked city, and reside in some other country. The Nuncio and Collector was also to hint the expediency of a subsidy to enable the Pope to leave Rome and Italy. The form of prayer was issued, says Collier, but no more done.

perhaps his death! The calmest looked on the suppression of the conspiracy and the almost total extirpation of the conspirators with satisfaction.[u]

Now came that event which, however foreseen by the few wiser prophetic spirits, burst on Europe and on Christendom with the stunning and appalling effect of absolute suddenness—the taking of Constantinople by the Turks. On no two European minds did this disaster work with more profound or more absorbing terror than on Pope Nicolas V. and Æneas Sylvius: nor could any one allege more sound reasons for that terror than the Pope and the Bishop of Sienna. Who could estimate better than Æneas, from his intimate knowledge of all the countries of Europe, of Italy, Germany, France, England, the extent of the danger which impended over the Latin world? Never since its earlier outburst might Mohammedanism seem so likely to subjugate if not to swallow up distracted and disunited Christendom, as under the Turks. By sea and land they were equally formidable. If Christendom should resist, on what frontier? All were menaced, all in danger. What city, what kingdom, would arrest the fierce, the perpetual invasion? From this period throughout the affairs of Germany (at Frankfort he preached a crusade) to the end of his Legatine power, of his Cardinalate, of his Papacy, of his life, this was the one absorbing thought, one passion, of Æneas Sylvius. The immediate advance of the victorious Mahommed through Hungary, Dalmatia, to the border, the centre of Italy, was stopped by a single fortress, Belgrade; by a preacher, John Capistrano; by a hero, John Huniades. But it was not till, above a century later, when Don John of Austria, at Lepanto by sea, and John Sobieski, A.D. 1472. before Vienna, by land, broke the spell of Mohammedan conquest, that Europe or Christendom might repose in security.[x]

The death of Nicolas V. was hastened, it was said, by the taking of Constantinople. Grief, shame, fear worked on a constitution broken by the gout. But Nicolas V.

[u] Leo Battista Alberti. Porcaria Conjuratio apud Muratori, xxv. p. 310.

[x] Compare Gibbon, ch. lxvii. xii. p. 162.

foresaw not that in remote futurity the peaceful, not the warlike, consequences of the fall of Constantinople would be most fatal to the Popedom—that what was the glory of Nicolas V. would become among the foremost causes of the ruin of mediæval religion: that it would aid in shaking to the base, and in severing for ever the majestic unity of Latin Christianity.[y]

[y] I cannot refrain, though my History closes with Nicolas V., from subjoining a few sentences on the end of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

On the death of Nicolas V., the Cardinal Bessarion, for learning, dignity, character, stood high above the whole College of Cardinals. The election had been almost declared in his favour. The Cardinal of Avignon was seized with indignation. "Would they have for a Pope a Greek, a recent proselyte, a man with a beard? Was the Latin Church fallen so low that it must have recourse to the Greeks?" The jealousy of the West was roused: a Spaniard, the first of the fatal house of Borgia, was raised to the Papal throne, Callistus III. Æneas was at Frankfort, pressing on reluctant Germany a crusade against the Turks. The Germans thought more of their contest with the Pope than of the security of Christendom. Frederick III. was urged to seize the opportunity of the election of a new Pope to assert the liberties of the Empire and of the German Church. Æneas averted the strife, and persuaded the Emperor that he had *more to hope than fear from the Pope*. He was sent with the congratulations of the Emperor to Callistus III. A promotion of Cardinals was expected. The name of Æneas was in all men's mouths: he received congratulations. The Pope named but three, one his nephew, Borgia, the future Alexander VI. Æneas was about to return to Germany, but his presence was needed in Italy: Sienna was besieged by James Piccinino: war threatened between the Pope and Alfonso King of Naples. Æneas, as ambassador to Naples, secured an honourable treaty. The Pope would not lose, and was obliged to reward the indispensable Æneas. He was created Cardinal of Sienna (Dec. 1456).

So, without dishonour or ingratitude, Æneas Sylvius was released from the service of his Imperial master. The Cardinal must devote himself to the interests of the Church; the Italian to those of Italy. He need breathe no more the thick and heavy air of Germany.

A year and a half has passed, and Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Aug. 21, A.D. 1458) is Pope Pius II.

Few men of more consummate ability had sat on the throne of St. Peter; few men more disposed to maintain the Papal power to the height of its supremacy. He boldly, unreservedly, absolutely condemned the heretical tenets of Æneas Sylvius. He reproached the King of France for the audacious Pragmatic Sanction: it was not less sacrilegious, not less impious than the decrees of the Council of Basle. But Pius II. had the sagacity to know that the days of Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. were passed. He learned by bitter experience that those too of Urban II. were gone by. It was not for want of exertion, or of eloquence far surpassing that which wrapt the Council of Clermont to frenzy, that Pius II. did not array Christendom in a more politic, more justifiable crusade against advancing Mohammedanism. Even the colder Council of Mantua seemed to kindle to enthusiasm. Against the Turks Germany would furnish 42,000 men; Hungary, 20,000 horse, 20,000 foot. Burgundy, 6000. The Duke of Burgundy accepted the command. Even the Italian kingdoms, dukedoms, republics, consented to be assessed. The Prince of Este threw down 300,000 florins. Italy was to raise a great fleet; France and Spain promised aid.

The proclamation of the Universal League of Christendom might seem a signal for a general war throughout Christendom. The war of the Roses raged in England; all Germany was in arms, bent on civil strife; the French fleet set sail, not against the Turks, but against Naples; Piccinino and Malatesta renewed the war in the Roman territory; the Savelli were in insurrection in Rome.

Pope Pius was not satisfied with endeavouring to rouse all Christendom to

Nicolas V. aspired to make Italy the domicile, Rome the capital, of letters and arts. As to letters, his was not the ostentatious patronage of a magnificent Sovereign; nor was it the sagacious policy which would enslave to the service of the Church that of which it might anticipate the dangerous rebellion. It was not the religion of authority seeking to make itself master of all which might hereafter either confirm or contest that authority. In Nicolas it was pure and genuine, almost innate, love of letters. In his lowlier station the ambition, pride, pleasure, passion, avarice of Thomas of Sarzana had been the study, the

a crusade against the Turks: he undertook a more Christian, if a more desperate enterprise, the conversion of the Sultan. He published a long elaborate address to Mahomet II. Throughout this singular document the tone is courteous, conciliatory, almost flattering; not till its close, denunciatory against the imposture of the Koran. "Nothing was wanting to make Mahomet the mightiest sovereign the world had ever seen, nothing but a little water for his baptism, and belief in the Gospel. The world would bow down before Mahomet the Christian Emperor." "The great Sultan is no careless Atheist, no Epicurean; he believes in God and in the immortality of the soul. What has been the end of all great conquerors,—Semiramis, Hercules, Bacchus, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, Julius Cæsar, Attila, Tamerlane? They are all burning in the flames of hell. Your law allows all to be saved by their own religion, except renegades from Islam; we maintain, on the contrary, that all who believe not our creed must be damned." From this dangerous argument the Pope proceeds to enlarge on the Christian as contrasted with the Mohammedan faith. However justly he might argue on Christianity, the stern predestinarians of Islam must have been surprised at finding themselves charged with supposing the world ruled by chance, not by Providence. There is much more strange lore on Mohammedan superstitions and Arabian priestcraft. The Turks were of a noble Scythian race: the Pope marvels that they can follow Egyptians and Arabians in their religion: Christianity had been a far more congenial faith.

How strangely, how nobly did Pius II., at the close of his life, redeem the weaknesses, the treachery, the inconsistency, the unblushing effrontery of self-interest of his earlier years. Pius II. was the only Pope who, in his deep and conscientious devotion, would imperil his own sacred person in the Crusade against the Turks, and engage in a war, if ever justifiable in a Pope, justifiable when the liberty, the Christianity of Europe might seem on the hazard. At Ancona (A.D. 1463), amid the total desertion of the leaders pledged to the Holy War; amid the host of common soldiers, murmuring that they had been paid only in Indulgences, in which they had ceased to trust, not in hard money; a host starving for want of sustenance, which the Pope, once the cool and politic statesman, now become a sanguine, enthusiastic old man, had not thought of providing; Pius II. alone maintained his courage. As the faith of others waxed cold, his became more ardent. He offered with one of his Cardinals to embark and throw himself into Ragusa, threatened by the Turks. And this refined and accomplished man died, as Peter the Hermit or St. Bernard might have died. The faithful Cardinal of Pavia watched his last moments. The sight of the sails of the Venetian fleet had for a moment kindled up all his ardour, but made him feel more deeply his failing strength. The Cardinal has described his end with the touching simplicity of real affection and reverence. "'Pray for me, my son,' were his last words." His friends bewailed and honoured him as a martyr in the cause of Christianity.*

* Comment. Card. Pavіensis, p. 359.

collection, of books. In every country into which he followed the train of the Cardinal Legate, his object was the purchase of manuscripts or copies of them. The Cardinal de Santa Croce (Albergati) encouraged him by his munificence; but the Cardinal's munificence could not keep pace with the prodigality of his follower. In his affluence Thomas devoted all he possessed to the same end, as in his poverty his most anxious fear had been lest he should be compelled to part with his treasures. So great was his reputation, that when Cosmo de' Medici proposed to open the Library of St. Marco at Florence, endowed with the books of Nicolo Nicoli, Thomas of Sarzana was requested to furnish a plan for the arrangement and for the catalogue. This became the model adopted in the other great libraries—that of the Badia at Florence, that of the Count of Montefeltro at Urbino, of Alexander Sforza at Pesaro. No sooner was Nicolas Pope than he applied himself to the foundation of the Vatican Library. Five thousand volumes were speedily collected. The wondering age boasted that no such library had existed since the days of the Ptolemies.

The scholars of Italy flocked to Rome, each to receive his task from the generous Pope, who rewarded their labours with ample payment. He seemed determined to enrich the West with all which survived of Grecian literature. The fall of Constantinople, long threatened, had been preceded by the immigration of many learned Greeks. Some, as the Cardinal Bessarion, had been naturalised after the Council of Florence.[z] France, Germany, even England, the Byzantine Empire, Greece, had been ransacked by industrious agents for copies of all the Greek authors. No branch of letters was without its interpreters. Notwithstanding the bold writings of Laurentius Valla, who had already startled the world by his discovery of the fraud of Constantine's donation, he was entrusted with the translation of Herodotus and Thucydides. Poggio undertook the Cyropædia of Xenophon and Diodorus Siculus; Nicolas Perotto, Polybius. Guarino of Verona

[z] Compare Disquisitio de Nicolas V. patrocinio. Ad calc. Vit. Nicol. V. a Pont. Max. erga literas et literarios viros Dominico Georgio. Roma, 1742.

and George of Tiferna, Strabo, the latter four books of Dion Prusæus, Pietro Candido, Appian.

Of the philosophers, Perotto sent out the Enchiridion of Epictetus; Theodore of Gaza some of the works of Theophrastus, and of Aristotle: George of Trebisond, the Laws of Plato. On George of Trebisond was imposed the more arduous task, the Almagest of Ptolemy. Lilius Ægidius contributed some of the works of the Alexandrian Philo. From Rinuccio of Arezzo came the Life and Fables of Æsop and the letters of Hippocrates; from John Aurispa, the Commentary of Hierocles on the golden verses of Pythagoras. Nicolas had an ardent desire to read the two great poems of Homer in Latin verse. They were only known by the prose version of Leontius Pilatus, executed under the care of Boccaccio. Philelpho, whom the Pope had received with eager cordiality, and bestowed on him, as a first gift, 500 golden ducats, relates, that just before his death, the Pope offered him a fine palace in Rome, and farms in the Roman territory, which would maintain his whole family in ease and honour, and to deposit ten thousand pieces of gold, to be paid when he should have finished the Iliad and the Odyssey.[a]

Nor were the Fathers of the Greek Church without due honour. Basil, the two Gregories, Cyril, the Evangelic Preparation of Eusebius by George of Trebisond, a new version of Dionysius the Areopagite, opened the theology of the Greeks to the enquiring West.[b]

There was not as yet any awful apprehension of impairing the sacred majesty of the Vulgate Bible. Manotti, a Florentine, in his day the most famous for his erudition, was authorised and urged to execute a new version of the whole Scriptures from the Hebrew and the Greek. He completed the Psalms from the Syriac, the whole New Testament, except perhaps the Acts of the Apostles.

Thus to Nicolas V., Italy, or rather Latin Christianity,

[a] Epist: Philipp. quoted in the Disquisitio, p. 194. Æneas Sylvius says that a certain Horace of Rome was employed on the Iliad. Part of the first book in Latin verse, with a dedication to Nicolas V., is in the Vatican.

[b] Nicolas obtained a copy of the Commentaries of Chrysostom on St. Matthew, which had been so rare in the west, that Aquinas had said he would rather possess it than the city of Paris.

mainly owes her age of learning, as well as its fatal consequence to Rome and to Latin Christianity, which in his honest ardour he would be the last to foresee. It was the splendid vision of Nicolas V. that this revival of letters, which in certain circles became almost a new religion, would not be the bondslave but the handmaid or willing minister of the old. Latin Christianity was to array itself in all the spoils of the ancient world, and so maintain as a natural result (there was nothing of policy in his thought), and with increasing and universal veneration, her dominion over the mind of man. The rebellion of Letters, and the effects of that rebellion, we must hereafter endeavour to explain.

Progress of human intellect.

But Rome under Nicolas V. was not to be the centre of letters alone, she was to resume her rank as the centre of Art, more especially of architectural magnificence. Rome was to be as of old the Lawgiver of Civilisation; pilgrims from all parts of the world, from curiosity, for business or from religion, were to bow down before the confessed supremacy of her splendid works.

The century from the death of Boniface VIII. to the accession of Martin V., during the Avignonese exile, and the Schism, had been a period of disaster, neglect, decay, ruin; of that slow creeping, crumbling ruin, which is perhaps more fatal to ancient cities than conflagration, usually limited in its ravages, or the irruption of barbarous enemies.[c] Martin V. had made some advances to the restoration of the financial prosperity of the Popedom; Eugenius IV. had re-asserted the endangered spiritual supremacy. Both had paid some attention to the dilapidated churches, palaces, walls of the city. Under Nicolas V. Rome aspired to rise again at once to her strength and to her splendour. The Pope was to be a great Sovereign Prince, but above the Sovereign Prince he was to be the successor of St. Peter. Rome was to be at once the strong citadel, and the noblest sanctuary in the world, unassailable by her enemies both without and within from her fortifications;

[c] Read Petrarch's well-known letter—Gibbon, Bunsen and Platner. 'Roms' Beschreibung.

commanding the world to awe by the unrivalled majesty of her churches.. The Jubilee had poured enormous wealth into the Treasury of the Pope; his ordinary revenues, both from the Papal territory and from Christendom at large, began to flow in with peace and with the revival of his authority. That wealth was all expended with the most liberal magnificence. Already had it dawned upon the mind of Nicolas V. that the Cathedral of the Chief of the Apostles ought to rival, or to surpass all the churches in Christendom in vastness and majesty. It was to be entirely rebuilt from its foundations.[d] Julius II. and Leo X. did but accomplish the design of Nicolas V. Had Nicolas lived, Bramante and Michael Angelo might have been prematurely anticipated by Rosellini of Florence, and Leo Battista Alberti. He had even erected an august and spacious Tribune, to be swept away with the rest of the building by his bolder and more ambitious successors. The mosaic pavement in the apse, begun by Nicolas V., was completed by Paul II., at the cost of more than 5000 pieces of gold.[e]

By the side, and under the shadow of this noblest of churches, the Supreme Pontiff was to have his most stately palace. The Lateran, and the Palace near S. Maria Maggiore, sumptuously restored by Nicolas V., were to bow before this more glorious edifice. The description may still be read of its spacious courts, its cool green gardens, its dashing fountains, its theatre, its hall for public ceremonies, for the conclave and the Pontifical coronation, the treasury, the library; this chamber, perhaps as dearest to the tastes of Nicolas, was the first part, if not the only part achieved. The Palace had its three stories for summer, for winter, and for spring, even to the offices and kitchens.[f] The Cardinals were to dwell around the Pope, if in less lofty, yet still in noble Palaces. The Vatican was to be the Capital of the Capital of Christendom. The whole Leonine city, which had too long lain

[d] Georgio, in his Life of Nicolas V., says (p. 166), Basilicam vero S. Petri Principis Apostolorum a fundamentis magnifice inchoare et perficere meditabatur. In the Life by Manetti (Muratori, I. R. T.) vol. iii. is a long description of the plan of the church, and the design of the Pope. See also Bonanni Templi Vaticani Historia, c. xi., with the references.

[e] Georgio, p. 167.

[f] In Manetti's Life of Nicolas V.

almost open to the invading stranger, and was not safe from the turbulent Romans, was to expand in security as well as splendour around the residence of St. Peter and his successors. The bridge of St. Angelo was bordered with turrets for defence and ornament; the Castle of St. Angelo, the citadel which commanded the bridge was strengthened by outward bulwarks, and by four towers at the corners, within laid out into halls and chambers. It was connected by strong walls with the Vatican; a huge tower began to rise, the commencement of formidable works of defence beyond the gardens of the Vatican. From the bridge of St. Angelo three broad streets, with open porticoes, and shops within them, were to radiate; the central one led direct to the portico of St. Peter's, before which Nicolas V. designed to set up the famous obelisk, which Sixtus V. at infinite cost, and with all the science of Fontana, hardly succeeded in placing on its base. The street to the left ran along the Tiber; that to the right, to the Vatican and the Palatine Gate.

Nor did the Pontiff design to expend all his munificence on St. Peter's and the Vatican. Decay, from violence or want of repair, had fallen on the forty churches called the Stations, visited by the more solemn processions, especially those which, with St. Peter's, made the more Holy Seven, the Lateran, St. Maria Maggiore, S. Stephen on Monte Celio, the Apostles, S. Paul and S. Lorenzo beyond the walls. All shared more or less in his restoring bounty. Three other churches, S. Maria beyond the Tiber, S. Theodore, S. Prassede were rebuilt; the Pantheon, now consecrated to the Virgin and all Saints, was covered with a roof of lead.

The Pontiff would secure the city from foreign foes, who for centuries, either through the feuds, the perfidy, or the turbulence of the Romans themselves, or from their own ambition or hostility, had desolated the city. In the whole circuit, from the Porta Flumentana to the Pyramid of Cestius, and so all round the city, the walls were strengthened, towers erected, fosses deepened. The Capitol was restored to its ancient strength and solidity. In order to convey his building materials to the city, perhaps provisions, he cleansed the channel of the Anio; he

repaired the stately aqueduct which brought the Acqua Vergine to the Fountain of Trevi. He restored the Milvian bridge.

The munificence of Nicolas confined not itself to Rome. Everywhere in the Roman territory rose churches, castles, public edifices. Already the splendid church of S. Francis, at Assisi, wanted repair; Nicolas built a church dedicated to S. Francis, at his favoured town of Fabriano; one at Gualdo in Umbria, to S. Benedict. Among his princely works was a castle at Fabriano, great buildings at Centumcellæ, the walls of Civita Castellana, a citadel at Narni, with bulwarks and deep fosses; another at Civita Vecchia; baths near Viterbo; buildings for ornament and for defence at Spoleto.[g]

The younger Arts, Sculpture and Painting began under his auspices still further to improve. Fra Angelico painted at Rome at the special command or request of Nicolas V.

Nicolas V., on his death-bed, communicated to the Cardinals, who stood around in respectful sorrow, his last Will and Testament. This solemn appeal, as it were, to God and man, after a copious and minute confession of faith, turned to his architectural works. These holy and worldly edifices he had raised not from ambition, from pride, from vain-glory, or for the perpetuation of his name, but for two great ends, the maintenance of the authority of the Church of Rome, and her more commanding dignity above all Christian people, as well as her security against lawless persecution. The majesty of such sacred imperishable monuments profoundly impresses the mind of man with the perpetuity, the eternity of religion. As to the secular buildings, the walls, towers, citadels, he recounts the dangers, the persecutions of Popes from early days; Popes insulted, Popes dethroned, Popes imprisoned, Popes banished, Popes murdered, from Eugenius II. through all the darker ages, down to the conspiracy of

[g] On the astonishment and admiration excited by the buildings of Nicolas V., read the passages of Æneas Sylvius, Vit. Frederic. III. "Quantum vero animo hic valeret, et quam vastus sit ejus animus, ejus ædificia monstrant, quo nemo aut magnificentius aut celerius aut splendidius quam ipse ædificavit. Nam turres et muri per eum constructi nulli priscorum arte vel magnitudine cedunt."—P. 138. "Namque ut priscorum Cæsarum moles totius urbis structura superat, sic ædificia Nicolai Papæ, quicquid ubique esset, moderni laboris excellunt."—P. 282. The Emperor Frederick, himself an excellent architect, stood in amazement.

Stephen Porcaro against himself. These were his motives for the conception and execution of so many sumptuous and so solid edifices. He proceeds to that sad burthen on his weary soul, the taking of Constantinople. He boasts with some, but surely blameless pride, of the peace of Italy; he had restrained, allayed, appeased the fierce wars among all the Princes and all the Republics.[h]

Nor does he speak with less satisfaction or delight of his own labours in the cause of Letters; the purchase of books, the copying of manuscripts, the encouragement of scholars; he appeals to the personal knowledge of the Cardinals, to the world, even to higher judgement, on his acquisition and his employment of the wealth of the Pontificate: "all these and every other kind of treasure, were not accumulated by avarice, not by simony, not by largesses, not by parsimony, as ye know; but only through the grace of the most merciful Creator, the peace of the Church, and the perpetual tranquillity of my Pontificate."[i]

Thus in Nicolas V. closed one great age of the Papacy. In Nicolas the Sovereign Italian Prince and the Pontiff met in serene and amicable dignity; he had no temptation to found a princely family. But before long the Pontiff was to be lost in the Sovereign Prince. Nor was it less evident that the exclusive dominion of Latin Christianity was drawing to a close, though nearly a century might elapse before the final secession of Teutonic Christianity, and the great permanent division of Christendom. Each successive Pontificate might seem determined to advance, to hasten that still slow but inevitable revolution; the audacious nepotism of Sixtus IV., the wickednesses of Alexander VI., which defy palliation; the wars of Julius II., with the hoary Pope at the head of ferocious armies; the political intrigues and disasters of Clement VII.

[h] "Bella ipsa, quibus undique frementibus jampridem tota hinc inde Italia vexabatur, ita compescuimus, ita denique sedavimus, ut omnes Principes, Respublicas, et Italos Populos ad maximam concordiam summamque pacem induceremus."

[i] "Hæc omnia pleraque alia divitiarum et gazarum genera nobis non ex avaritiâ, non ex simoniâ, non ex largitionibus, non ex parsimoniâ ut scitis, sed ex divinâ duntaxat benignissimi Creatoris gratiâ, et ex pace Ecclesiasticâ perpetuâque Pontificatus noster tranquillitate provenisse non dubitamus."—Ibid. Manetti seems to assert that this long testament was read by the dying Pope. The improbability of this throws no doubt on its authenticity.

BOOK XIV.

CHAPTER I.

SURVEY.

FROM the reign of Nicolas V. and the close of our history, as from a high vantage ground, we must survey the whole realm of Latin Christendom—the political and social state, as far as the relation of Latin Christianity to the great mass of mankind, the popular religion, with its mythology; the mental development in philosophy, letters, arts.

Eight centuries and a half had elapsed since the Pontificate of Gregory the Great—the epoch of the supreme dominion of Latin Christianity in the West. The great division of mankind, which at that time had become complete and absolute, into the clergy (including the monks, and in later days the friars) and the rest of mankind, still subsisted in all its rigorous force. They were two castes, separate and standing apart as by the irrepealable law of God. They were distinct, adverse, even antagonistic, in their theory of life, in their laws, in their corporate property, in their rights, in their immunities. In the aim and object of their existence, in their social duties and position, they were set asunder by a broad, deep, impassable line. But the ecclesiastical caste being bound, at least by its law, to celibacy, in general could not perpetuate its race in the ordinary course of nature; it was renewed by drawing forth from the laity men either endowed with or supposed to be trained to a peculiar mental turn, those in whom the intellectual capacity predominated over the physical force. Religion, which drove many out of the world within the sacred circle, might be a sentiment, a passion, an unthinking and unreasoning

impulse of the inward being: holy ignorance might be the ambition, the boast, of some monks, and of the lower friars; but in general the commission to teach the religion implied, (though itself an infused gift or grace, and the inseparable consequence of legitimate consecration to the office) some superiority of mind. At all events, the body was to be neglected, sacrificed, subdued, in order that the inner being might ripen to perfection. The occupations of the clergy were to be in general sedentary, peaceful, quiescent. Their discipline tended still further to sift, as it were, this more intellectual class: the dull and negligent sunk into the lower offices, or, if belonging by their aristocratic descent to the higher, they obtained place and influence only by their race and connections, wealth and rank by unclerical powers of body and of mind. These were ecclesiastics by profession, temporal princes, even soldiers, by character and life. But this, according to the strict theory of the clerical privilege, was an abuse, an usurpation. Almost all minds which were gifted with or conscious of great intellectual capacity, unless kings, or nobles, or knights, whose talents might lead to military distinction, appeared predestined for, were irresistibly drawn into, or were dedicated by their prescient parents or guardians to the Church. The younger sons, especially the illegitimate sons, even of kings, far more of princes and nobles, were devoted, as the Church became wealthy and powerful, to this career as a provision. But even with this there either was, or according to general opinion there ought to have been, some vocation and some preparation: many of these were among the ablest, some even among the most austere and pious of churchmen. The worst, if they did not bring the more fitting qualifications, brought connection, famous names (in feudal times of great importance), and thus welded together, as it were, the Church with the State.

Education.

Education, such as it was (and in many cases for the times it was a high education), had become, with rare exceptions, their exclusive privilege. Whoever had great capacities or strong thirst for knowledge could neither obtain nor employ it but in the peaceful

retirement, under the sacred character, with the special advantages of the churchman, or in the cloister. The whole domain of the human intellect was their possession. The universities, the schools, were theirs, and theirs only. There the one strife was between the secular clergy and the regulars—the monks, or the friars the disciples of S. Dominic and S. Francis. They were the canon lawyers, and for some centuries, as far as it was known or in use, the teachers and professors of the civil law. They were the historians, the poets, the philosophers. It was the first omen of their endangered supremacy that the civil lawyers in France rose against them in bold rivalry. When in the Empire the study of the old Roman law developed principles of greater antiquity, therefore, it was asserted, of greater authority, than the canon law, it was at once a sign and a proof that their absolute dominion was drawing towards its close—that human intellect was finding another road to distinction and power. Physical science alone, in general, though with some famous exceptions, they unwisely declined: they would not risk the popular suspicion of magical and forbidden arts—a superstition which themselves indulged and encouraged. The profound study of the human body was thought inconsistent with the fastidious modesty of their profession.[a] The perfection of medicine and of all cognate inquiries, indeed in general of natural philosophy itself, was left to Jews and Arabs: the great schools of medicine, Montpellier and Salerno, as they derived their chief wisdom from these sources, so they freely admitted untonsured, perhaps unbaptised students. It is difficult to calculate the extent of this medical influence, which must have worked, if in secret, still with great power. The jealousy and hatred with which Jews or supposed unbelievers are seen at the courts of kings is a secret witness to that influence. At length we find the king's physician, as under Louis XI., the rival in authority of the king's confessor. In this alone the hierarchical caste does not

[a] The observant Chaucer gives the converse. Physicians were even then under the evil fame of irreligion. "Ilis studie was but littel on the Bible." Prologue on the Doctor of Physique.

maintain its almost exclusive dominion over all civil as well as ecclesiastical transactions.

For it is not only from their sacred character, but from their intellectual superiority, that they are in the courts, in the councils, of kings; that they are the negotiators, the ambassadors of sovereigns; they alone can read and draw up state papers, compacts, treaties, or frame laws. Writing is almost their special mystery; the notaries, if not tonsured, as they mostly were, are directed, ordered by the Clergy: they are in general the servants and agents of ecclesiastics. In every kingdom of Europe the Clergy form one of the estates, balance or blindly lead the nobles; and this too not merely as churchmen and enrolled in the higher service of God, but from their felt and acknowledged pre-eminence in the administration of temporal affairs.

To this recognised intellectual superiority, arising out of the power of selecting the recruits for their army according to their mental stature, their sole possession of the discipline necessary to train such men for their loftier position, and the right of choosing, as it were, their officers out of this chosen few—must be added their spiritual authority, their indefeasible power of predeclaring the eternal destiny of every living layman. To doubt the sentence of that eternal destiny was now an effort of daring as rare as it was abhorrent to the common sense of men. Those who had no religion had superstition; those who believed not trembled and were silent; the speculative unbeliever, if there were such, shrouded himself in secresy from mankind, even from himself: the unuttered lawless thought lay deep in his own heart. Those who openly doubted the unlimited power of the clergy to absolve were sects, outcasts of society, proscribed not only by the detestation of the clergy, but by the popular hatred. The keys of heaven and hell were absolutely in the hands of the priesthood—even more, in this life they were not without influence. In the events of war, in the distribution of earthly misery or blessing, abundance or famine, health or pestilence, they were the intercessors with the saints, as the saints were intercessors with heaven. They

were invested in a kind of omniscience. Confession, since the decree of the Lateran Council under Innocent III., an universal, obligatory, indispensable duty, laid open the whole heart of every one, from the Emperor to the peasant, before the priesthood; the entire moral being of man, undistinguishable from his religious being, was under their supervision and control, asserted on one side, acknowledged on the other. No act was beyond their cognisance, no act, hardly any thought, was secret. They were at once a government and a police, to which every one was bound to inform against himself, to be the agent of the most rigid self-delation, to endure the closest scrutiny, to be denied the least evasion or equivocation, to be submitted to the moral torture of menaced, of dreaded damnation if he concealed or disguised the truth, to undergo the most crushing, humiliating penance. Absolution, after which the soul thirsted with insatiable thirst, might be delayed, held in suspense, refused; if granted it was of inestimable price. The sacraments, absolutely necessary to spiritual life, were at their disposal. Baptism to the infant would hardly be refused; but the Eucharist, Christ himself offered on the altar, God made by consecrated hands, God materialised down to the rudest apprehension, could be granted or withheld according to the arbitrary, irresponsible judgement of the priest. The body, after death, might repose in consecrated ground with the saints, or be cast out, to be within the domain, the uncontested prey of devils. The Excommunication cut the man off, whatever his rank or station, from the Church, beyond whose pale was utter impossibility of salvation. No one could presume to have hope for a man who died under excommunication. Such were the inculcated, by most recognised, at least apprehended, doctrines. The Interdict, the special prerogative of the Pope, as the antagonist, the controller of Sovereigns, smote a kingdom with spiritual desolation, during which the niggardly and imperfect rites, the baptism sparingly administered, the rest of the life without any religious ceremony, the extreme unction or the last sacrament coldly vouchsafed to the chosen few, the churchyard closed against the dead,

seemed to consign a whole nation, a whole generation, to irrevocable perdition.

Thus throughout the world no man could stand alone; the priest was the universal lord of the universal human conscience. The inward assurance of faith, of rectitude, of virtue, of love of man or love of God, without the ratification of the confessor; the witness of the spirit within, unless confirmed, avouched by the priest, was nothing. Without the passport to everlasting life, everlasting life must recede from the hopes, from the attainment of man. And by a strange yet perhaps unavoidable anomaly, the sacredness of the priest was inalienable, indefeasible, altogether irrespective of his life, his habits, his personal holiness or unholiness. There might be secret murmurs at the avarice, pride, licentiousness of the priest: public opinion might even in some cases boldly hold him up to shame and obloquy, he was still priest, bishop, pope; his sacraments lost not their efficacy, his verdict of condemnation or absolution was equally valid; all the acts of John XXIII., till his deposal, were the acts of the successor of St. Peter. And if this triumph over the latent moral indignation of mankind was the manifestation of its strength, so its oppugnancy to that indignation was its fall; it was the premonition, the proclamation of its silent abrogation in the hearts of men. The historian has to state the fact, rather than curiously and judicially to balance the good and evil (for good there undoubtedly was, vast good in such ages of class tyrannising over class, of unintermitting war on a wide or a narrow scale, of violence, lawlessness, brutality) in this universal sacerdotal domination.

Monks and Friars.

It is impossible to estimate the fluctuating proportion between these two castes of the Christian population to each other. The number of the Secular Clergy was of course, to a certain extent, limited by the spiritual wants of the community and the means of maintenance. But it comprehended within the sacred circle of immunity and privilege a vast host of unenrolled and subordinate retainers, those who had received for some purpose of their own, some who in the ruder ages had been compelled to take the simple tonsure, some admitted to what were called

the lower orders, and who in all large churches, as sub-deacons, acolyths, singers, were very numerous, down to those who held more menial offices, sacristans, beadles, servants of all classes. But there was absolutely nothing to limit the number of Monks, still less that of the Friars in their four Orders, especially the disciples of S. Dominic and S. Francis. No one was too poor or too low to become a privileged and sacred Mendicant. No qualification was necessary but piety or its semblance, and that might too easily be imitated. While these Orders in the Universities boasted of the most erudite and subtle, and all-accomplished of the Schoolmen, they could not disdain or altogether reject those who in the spirit, at least of one of their Founders, maintained the superiority of holy ignorance. Instead of being amazed that the Friars swarmed in such hordes over Christendom, it is rather wonderful, that the whole abject and wretched peasantry, rather than be trampled to the earth, or maddened to Flagellantism Jacquerié, or Communism, did not all turn able-bodied religious Beggars, so the strong English sense of Wycliffe designates the great mass of the lower Franciscans in England. The Orders themselves, as was natural when they became wealthy and powerful, must have repressed rather than encouraged the enrolment of such persons; instead of prompting to the utmost, they must have made it a distinction, a difficulty, a privilege, to be allowed to enter upon the enjoyment of their comparatively easy, roving, not by all accounts too severe life. To the serf inured to the scanty fare and not unfrequent famine, the rude toil and miserable lodging; and to the peasant with his skin hard to callousness, and his weather-beaten frame, the fast, the maceration, even the flagellation of the Friar, if really religious (and to the religious these self-inflicted miseries were not without their gratification) must have been no very rigorous exchange; while the freedom to the serf, the power of wandering from the soil to which he was bound down, the being his own property, not that of another, must have been a strong temptation. The door must have been closed with some care; some stern examination, probation, or inquiry, must have preceded the initiation and the adop-

tion of brethren into the fraternity, or the still enlarging houses had been too narrow; they would have multiplied into unmanageable numbers. Yet, if more cold and repulsive in the admission of those humbler votaries, the protests of the Universities, and other proofs, show that the more promising and higher youth, were sought with ardent proselytism.[b]

The property, especially the territorial and landed property of the Hierarchy and the Monastic Orders it is equally impossible to estimate. It varied, of course, in different ages, and in every kingdom in Christendom. Nor if we knew at any one time the proportionate extent of Church lands to that not under mortmain would it be any measure, or any sure criterion, of their relative value. This property, instead of standing secure in its theoretic inalienability, was in a constant fluctuation: the Papal territory itself was frequently during the darker centuries usurped, recovered, granted away, resumed. Throughout Christendom the legal inalienability of Church lands was perpetually assailed in earlier times by bold depredators, and baffled by ingenious devices of granting away the usufruct. We have heard perpetual complaints against these kinds of endowments of their sons or descendants by the married clergy; the unmarried yet dissolute or extravagant beneficiaries were no doubt as regardless of the sanctity of ecclesiastical property, and as subtle in conveying away its value to their kinsmen, or for their own immediate advantage. Besides, all these estates, held in absolute property, was the tithe of the produce of all other lands.[c] The whole sacerdotal system of Latin Christianity, first from analogy, afterwards as direct precedent, assumed all the privileges, powers, rights, endowments of the Levitical priesthood; and thus arraying itself in the irrefragable authority of God's older Word, of which it did not

[b] On the degenerate state of the Friars the serious prose and the satirical poetry is full of details. Read too the Supplication of Beggars (a later production, temp. Henry VIII.), and the inimitable Colloquies of Erasmus. One of the reasons alleged at the Council of Trent against submitting the regulars to episcopal discipline was their "numero eccessivo."—Sarpi, lii. p. 158. Ed. Helmstadt.

[c] Hallam has summed up (Middle Ages. c. vii.) with his usual judgement and accuracy what is most important on this subject, in Father Paul, Muratori, Giannone, Fleury, and Schmidt.

acknowledge the abrogation where its interests were so nearly concerned, claimed the tithe as of inherent, perpetual, divine law. From an early period Christians had been urged to devote this proportion of their wealth to religious uses; a proportion so easy and natural that it had prevailed, and had obtained a prescriptive authority, as the rule of sacred oblation to the temples among the customs of many Heathen nations.[d] The perpetual claim to tithes was urged by Councils and by Popes in the sixth century. Charlemagne throughout his empire, King Ethelwolf, and, later, Edward the Confessor in England, either overawed by the declared authority of the Old Testament, or thinking it but a fair contribution to the maintenance of public worship and for other religious uses, gave the force of civil law to this presumed sacred obligation. During several centuries it was urged by the preachers, not merely as an indispensable part of Christian duty, but as a test of Christian perfection.[e]

Tithe was first received by the Bishop, and distributed by him in three or in four portions; to himself, to the clergy, for the fabric of the churches, for the poor. But all kinds of irregularities crept into the simple and stately uniformity of this universal tax and its administration. It was retained by the Bishop; the impoverished clergy murmured at their meagre and disproportionate share. As the parochial divisions became slowly and irregularly distinct and settled, it was in many cases, but by no means universally, attached to the cure of souls. The share of the fabric became uncertain and fluctuating, till at length other means were found for the erection and the maintenance of the Church buildings. The more splendid Prelates and Chapters, aided by the piety of Kings, Barons, and rich men, disdained this fund, so insufficient for their magnificent designs; the building of churches was exacted from the devotion or the superstition of the laity in general, conjointly with the munificence of the ecclesiastics.

[d] In the controversy which arose on the publication of Selden's book on Tithes, the High Church writers, Montague and Tildesley, were diffuse and triumphant in their quotations from Heathen writers, as though, by showing the concurrence of universal religion with the Mosaic institutes, to make out tithes to be a part of Natural Religion. See abstract of their arguments in Collier.

[e] Paoli Sarpi, quoted by Mr. Hallam.

So, too, the right of the poor to their portion became a freewill contribution, measured by the generosity or the wealth of the Clergy; here a splendid, ever-flowing largess; there a parsimonious, hardly-extracted dole.

The tithe suffered the fate of other church property: it was at times seized, alienated, appropriated by violence or by fraud. It was retained by the Bishops or wealthy clergy, who assigned a miserable stipend to a poor Vicar; it fell into the hands of lay impropriators, who had either seized it, or, on pretence of farming it, provided in the cheapest manner for the performance of the service; the Monasteries got possession of it in large portions, and served the cures from their Abbey or Cloister. In England it was largely received by foreign Beneficiaries, who never saw the land from which they received this tribute.

Still, however levied, however expended, however invaded by what were by some held to be sacrilegious hands, much the larger part of this tenth of all the produce of the land throughout Christendom, with no deduction, except the moderate expense of collection, remained in the hands of the Hierarchy. It was gradually extended from the produce of land to all other produce, cattle, poultry, even fish.

The High Aristocracy of the Church, from the Pope to the member of the capitular body, might not disdain to participate in this, which ought to have been the exclusive patrimony of the parochial and labouring clergy: but their estates, which were Lordships, Baronages, Princedoms, in the Pope a kingdom, were what placed them on a level with, or superior to, the Knights, Barons, Princes, Kings of the world.

These possessions throughout Latin Christendom, both of the Seculars and of the Monasteries, if only calculated from their less clerical expenditure, on their personal pomp and luxury, on their wars, on their palaces, and from their more honourable prodigality on their cathedrals, churches, monastic buildings, must have been enormous; and for some period were absolutely exempt from contribution to the burthens of the State.[f] We have seen the first throes

[f] Some estates of the Church were held on the tenure of military service, most in Francalmoigne.—Hallam.

and struggles of Papal nepotism; we have seen bold attempts to quarter the kinsmen of Popes on the territories of the Papacy, even to create noble patrimonies, or even principalities, in their favour; but there is no Papal family of the time preceding Nicolas V. which boasts its hereditary opulence or magnificent palace, like the Riarios, Farneses, Barberinis, Corsinis, of later times. The Orsinis and Colonnas were Princes created Popes, not descendants of Popes. The vast wealth of the Archbishopric of Milan has shone before us; an Archbishop was the founder of the Ducal House of Visconti. In Italy, however, in general, the Prelates either never possessed or were despoiled of the vast wealth which distinguished the Ultramontane Prelates. Romagna had become the Papal domain; Ravenna had been compelled to yield up her rival territory. The Crusades had not thrown the lands into their hands by the desertion of their lords. In the commercial wealth of Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, they had no share. At Constance, as it has appeared, the Ultramontanes feared that the poverty of the Italian Bishops would place them at the command of the Pope. In Germany the Prince-Archbishops, the Electors, were not scrupulous in extending the wide pale of their ecclesiastical principalities. The grant of estates, of territories, was too common a bribe or a reward from a doubtful aspirant to the Imperial throne. How many fiefs held by Mentz, by Treves, and by Cologne, dated from the eve, or from the coronation of an Emperor, raised to the throne after a severe contest! Among the other Prince-Prelates of the Empire, distracted as Germany was for centuries by wars between the Popes and the Emperors, wars between the Emperor and his refractory subjects, their power was perpetually increasing their wealth, their wealth aggrandising their power. They were too useful allies not to be subsidised by the contending parties; and those subsidies, being mostly in grants of lands, enhanced the value of their alliance.

In France, the prodigality of the weaker Kings of each race, and each race successively, from the fainéant Merovingians, seemed to dwindle down into inevitable weakness,

had vied with each other in heaping estates upon the clergy, and in founding and endowing monasteries. If the later Kings, less under strong religious impulses, and under heavier financial embarrassments, were less prodigal; if the mass of secular ecclesiastical property is of earlier date,[g] few reigns passed without the foundation of some religious houses. The Mendicant Orders had their spacious and splendid convents in Paris,[h] and in the other great cities of France.[i]

In England the Statute of Mortmain had been the National Protest against the perpetual encroachment of the Church on the landed property of the realm. At length the subtlety of the Lawyers baffled the subtlety of the Churchmen; the strong, stern Law, could be neither infringed nor eluded. But it left the Church in possession of all which had been heaped at her feet by the prodigal Anglo-Saxon Kings, and the Normans hardly less prodigal. If it had not passed down absolutely undiminished, it had probably on the whole been constantly enlarging its borders; if usurped, or its usufruct, if not the fee, fraudulently made away,[k] it had in many cases widely extended itself by purchase, as well as by donation and bequest.[l]

[g] The Abbé Maury, in the debate on the confiscation of church property, asserted that the tenure of some of their estates was older than Clovis. (Lamartine, Les Constituants, iii. p. 113.) In the debates on the confiscation of church property in the National Assembly in 1789, 1790, M. Talleyrand estimated the income of the clergy from tithes at eighty millions of francs, from the lands at seventy millions; total one hundred and fifty millions. This, I presume, did not include the lands, at least not the houses of the monasteries. (Buchon et Roux, Hist. Parlementaire de la Rév. Française, iii. p. 156.) In the proposal for the suppression of the religious houses, M. Treilhard declared that four hundred millions might be produced by the sale of the monastic houses, which might be secularised. Those in Paris alone might be sold for one hundred and fifty millions. A calculation was produced, made in 1775, that at 150 livres the toise, they would yield 217,309,000 livres. In another report it was stated that the clergy held one-fifth of the net revenue from land in France, amounting to two hundred millions, exclusive of the tithe. (T. v. p. 328.)

[h] See Dulaure, Hist. de Paris, a book with much valuable information, but hostile to the clergy.

[i] At the Revolution six Orders had three houses in Paris, some others two. They must have amounted to between forty and fifty.

[k] Churches were leased to laymen, and without doubt became their actual property; as such were bought and sold.

[l] The Church bought largely. The statute "Quia Emptores" shows abundantly that the possessions of the Church were greatly increased by purchase as well as by donation and bequest. It was a very common practice to purchase an estate in reversion, or to purchase and grant the estate to the

There are four periods at which public documents seem at first sight to throw a steady and distinct light on the extent and value of church property in England, its actual if not its relative value. Yet on examination the result of the inquiry becomes dim, confused, and contradictory. It offers no more than a very rude and uncertain approximation to positive conclusions.

I. Doomsday-Book gives the lands in the possession of ecclesiastics, as well as lay holders, those of bishops, chapters, churches, monasteries. The first inspection of Doomsday may seem to present startling facts. In the whole County of Kent, besides the King (with whom the Churches of St. Martin in Dover and the Church of Canterbury share those towns), appear as landowners:—1. The Archbishop of Canterbury; 2. His Monks (Christ-Church); 3. The Bishop of Rochester; 4. The Bishop of Bayeux;[m] 5. The Abbey of Battle; 6. St. Augustines; 7. Abbey of St. Peter's, Ghent. Only four knights, and Albert the Chaplain. In Middlesex are the King, the Archbishop, the Bishop of London, his Canons (of St. Paul's), the Abbot of Westminster, the Abbot of the Holy Trinity in Rouen, the Abbot of Barking, with eighteen others, barons and knights. In Worcestershire the King, the Church of Worcester, the Bishop of Hereford, the Church of St. Denys near Paris, the Church of Cormelies, the Abbeys of Westminster, Pershore, Evesham; the Bishop of Bayeux, the Church of St. Guthlac, the Clerks of Wrehampton, with fifteen laymen. In Berkshire, among sixty-three holders, are the King, five Bishops, among them Durham and Coutances, ten Abbots and Abbesses. In Devonshire, of fifty-three, are the King, two Bishops, Exeter and Coutances, ten abbeys, among them Rouen, Mont St. Michael, St. Stephen, and Holy Trinity at Caen. During the reign of our Norman sovereigns these transmarine monasteries held their lands in England. They were either cells or dependent priories which sent their

former Lord for his life: on his death (si obire contigerit) it fell to the Church. Few rich men entered a monastery without bringing some estate or provision with them, which became the inalienable property of the Community. See instances in Taylor's Index Monasticus.

[m] Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, held lands in sixteen counties.—Sir H. Ellis, Introduction.

revenues across the sea. As England and France became hostile powers they were gradually seized, till at length, in the time of Henry V., they were confiscated by the strong hand of the law, and vested by Act of Parliament in the Crown.[n] Our history has dwelt, on more than one occasion, on the estates and benefices held by foreign prelates, chiefly Italians.

II. The valuation made in the reign of Edward I., by order of Pope Nicolas IV. The whole ecclesiastical property was assessed at rather more than 200,000*l.*, a valuation much higher than had been admitted before; the tenth levied was above 20,000*l.*[o]

III. The remarkable petition of the Commons to Henry IV.,[p] for the confiscation of the whole Church property and its appropriation to the maintenance of a nobility, knighthood, squirehood, burghership, and almshouses, retaining only a priesthood of 15,000, without distinction of Orders, and on the annual stipend of seven marks each. This wild revolutionary scheme estimated the temporalities of the Church at 322,000 marks a year.[q] They were thrown together in large masses, each of 20,000, as—1. The see of Canterbury, with the abbeys of Christ-Church, St. Augustine, Shrewsbury, Coggleshal, St. Osyth. 2. York (not including Fontaines, Rivaux, and some other abbeys). 3. Six of the larger abbeys, Dover, Battle, Lewes, Coventry, Daventry, and Tournay (Thorney?) make up another 20,000.[r] The total estimate of the Church property may seem to have been based on the valuation of Pope Nicolas, the established cataster which had been acted upon for above a century. It is curious, however, as setting down the annual income necessary to maintain the state of an Earl at 3000 marks; of a Knight at 100, with four plough-lands; an Esquire 40, with two

[n] Ellis, Introduction to Doomsday. Collier, i. p. 650.

[o] See vol. v. p. 185, and note, for the details, A.D. 1292.

[p] Walsingham, p. 379. Introd. Fox, ii. p. 725, A.D. 1410.

[q] That is (calculating the mark at two-thirds of a pound, 13*s.* 4*d.*), nearly the same as the Papal valuation.

[r] Walsingham seems to say that they were set to prove this vast wealth of the clergy, and failed: "Sed cum niterentur ostendere de quibus locis tam grandes summæ levari possent, unde præmissi dotarentur vel ditarentur, defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio et dum diligunt vanitatem quæsivere mendacium."

plough-lands. How the poor Priest was to live on his seven marks, unless by the bounty and hospitality of his parishioners—certainly with no hospitality or almsgiving on his own—these early levellers seem not to have thought.[s] About this period, according to another statement, there were in England 46,822 churches, 52,285 villæ, 53,225 military fiefs, of which the ecclesiastics and religious held 28,000. Thus they were in possession of above one half of the knights' fees in the realm.[t]

IV. The valuation of the whole church property, immediately before the suppression of the larger monasteries,[u] as compared with that of Nicolas IV., might be expected to furnish at once a positive and a relative estimate of the Church possessions. In the Act for the suppression of the smaller monasteries,[x] those with an income under 200*l.* a year, it was supposed that about 380 communities would be dissolved (about 100 then escaped or eluded dissolution), and that the Crown would derive 32,000*l.* of yearly revenue from the confiscation, with 100,000*l.* in plate, jewels, money, and other valuables. After the suppression of the larger monasteries,[y] the amount of the whole revenue escheated to the Crown was calculated at 161,000*l.*[z] A little before this period the revenue of England from lands

[s] This concurrence, which is at least approximate, may appear to be of higher authority than the calculation drawn from a passage of Knighton, which would more than double the amount of church property. In the year 1337 two Cardinal Legates came to England. They received for their expenses 50 marks a day, which was raised by four pennies from every benefice, exempt or not exempt. The revenue of the Church would thus amount to 2000 marks a day; multiplied by 365, 730,000 marks; nearly 500,000*l.* Macpherson's Annals of Commerce, i. 519; Hallam. But the Valor of Pope Nicolas was framed by those who wished as much as possible to elude or lighten their taxation.

[t] This rests on a passage in the Appendix to Hearne's Avebury. Mr. Sharon Turner, v. 166, quotes it. Mr. Hallam appears to accept its results, Middle Ages, ii. p. 506. Other authorities, quoted in Taylor, p. xxiii., make 60,215 knights' fees; those held by the clergy 23,115. Spelman brings down the proportion to a third; so too Sir W. Temple.

[u] Ann. Hen. VIII. 26. A.D. 1534, published by the Record Commission, to be compared with Speed's Catalogue of Religious Houses, Benefices, &c. On the revenues of the monasteries, see Dugdale and Stevens, Mr. Nasmyth's excellent edition of Tanner's Notitia. No book is more instructive than the Index Monasticus of the diocese of Norwich, by Mr. Richd. Taylor, London, 1821.

[x] Burnet, 192, 222. Rymer, xiv. 574. Stevens, Appendix to Dugdale. Lingard, c. iv. Burnet gives 131,607*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* for the larger monasteries, but adds, "*it was at least ten times the sum in true value.*"

[y] Lord Herbert; Speed; Hume, c. 31.

[z] It is singular that these two sums amount to near 200,000*l.* The whole property of the Church, according to the valuation of Nicolas IV., stood at about 204,000*l.*, so that the value of Monastic property was then near that of the whole Church property under Edward I.

and possessions had been calculated at 4,000,000*l.*:[a] the monastic property, therefore, was not more than a twentieth part of the national property. To this must be added the whole Church property that remained, that of the Bishops, Chapters, Colleges, and Parochial Clergy.[b] The Valor Ecclesiasticus of Henry VIII. offers no sum total; but, according to Speed, the whole value was 320,150*l.* 10*s.* If of this, 186,512*l.* 8*s.* 11½*d.* was the gross value of that of the monasteries (the sum escheated to the King, 161,000*l.*), the secular property was about half of the whole. Together the two sums would amount to a tenth of the revenue of the kingdom as estimated by Hume.[c]

But this estimate is very fallacious,[d] both as to the extent and the actual value[e] of the Church property. As to the extent, in London and the neighbouring counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Essex, the Church lands, or at least the lands in which the Church had some tenure, must have been enormous. Hardly a parish in Middlesex did not belong, certainly so far as manorial rights, to the Bishop of London, the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, the Abbot and monks of Westminster, and other religious houses—the Carthusians, St. John's Clerkenwell (the Hospitallers), Sion, and many smaller foundations. The Chapter of St. Paul's swept in a broad belt round the north of London

[a] This is stated by Hume, and on such a subject Hume was likely to be accurate, but he does not give his authority.

[b] One insulated point of comparison has offered itself. According to the Valor of Nicolas, Christ Church, Canterbury, was assessed at 355*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.* under Henry VIII. at 2,349*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*, an increase of about seven times.

[c] When, by Bishop Burnet's advice (Burnet's own Times. edit. Oxford, v. p. 118), the First Fruits and Tenths were made over to the Board, called Queen Anne's Bounty, the tenths were reckoned at 11,000*l.*, which has now remained unaltered, according to the valuation of Henry VIII. This would make the property 111,000*l.* Speed gives 111,207*l.* 14*s.* 2*d.*, but a certain portion had been appropriated to the Bishops and Chapters, which makes up the total.

[d] Some of the richer monasteries had sunk to a small oligarchy. Chertsey, with 14 monks, had 740*l.* a year; Furness, with 30, 966*l.* It is curious to compare Hume and Lingard. Both select Furness as their example (Hume puts Furness in Lincolnshire). Hume gives the small number of monks as compared with the great income; on the signal iniquity of the mode in which the suppression was enforced he is silent. Lingard is coldly eloquent, as is his wont, on the iniquity—of the small number of monks not a word.

[e] On the important question of the relative value of money at that time and the present, taking in the joint consideration of weight of silver and price of provisions, Mr. Taylor, in 1821, would multiply by 15 times. Land in Norfolk let from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* an acre; wages for a haymaker were, during Henry VII. and Henry VIII., 1*d.* to 1½*d.* a day. The whole ecclesiastical revenues in the diocese of Norwich would be worth 510,000*l.* a year.

till they met the Church of Westminster at Hampstead and Paddington.[f] The Abbot of Westminster was almost a prince of Westminster.[g]

On the other hand, the estates and manors of the Church and of the monasteries, though, as probably having been the longest under cultivation, the best cultivated, in productive value were far below their imagined wealth. The Church was by usage, perhaps from interest, an indulgent landlord. Of the estates, a large part had become copyhold, and paid only a moderate quit-rent, and a small fixed fine on renewal. Of those on which the Church reserved the full fee, the fines on renewals, whether on lives or for terms of years, were no doubt extremely moderate. They had become hereditary in families, and acquired the certainty of actual possession. The rents were paid in money, usually of small amount, in services to the landlord (the Prebendary or the Church), in the cultivation of their lands, and to a considerable extent in kind. Probably the latter contribution was not taken into the account of their value. But not only had each monastery its common refectory, each Chapter had its common establishment, its common table, its horses, and other conveniences, largely supplied by the growers; hay and straw, beasts, poultry furnished at specified times by the tenants. Each had its mill, its brewhouse, its bakery; and no doubt the annual expenses of the House, or Domus, were to a large extent supplied from these unreckoned sources.[h] Yet on the

[f] Archdeacon Hale has printed, not yet published (for the Camden Society), what he calls the Domesday of St. Paul; the Visitation of the manors of the Dean and Chapter (not the separate estates of the prebendaries). It throws great light on this point, as well as on the tenure and condition of the Church property.

[g] At the Dissolution Westminster was the most wealthy monastery—it was estimated at 3977*l.*; St. John's, Clerkenwell, the richest of the military orders, 2385*l.*; Sion, the richest nunnery, 1944*l.*—Speed.

[h] All this throws light on a very curious state of things at St. Paul's; no doubt not peculiar to St. Paul's. The Chapter consisted of 30 Prebendaries, each with his separate estate, and originally his right to share in the common fund, on condition of performing certain services in the Church. The Prebendaries withdrew each to the care and enjoyment of his Prebend, or, if a Pluralist, of many Prebends, leaving the duties to be performed by certain Residentiaries; so when the daily mass, the perpetual office, was imposed as a burthen, it was difficult to keep up the number of Residentiaries. In process of time the Common Fund grew larger, the emoluments and advantages from oblations, obits, and other sources increased in value; there was then a strife and a press to become a Residentiary. It was necessary (the exhausted fund was the plea) to obtain Papal or Archiepiscopal decrees to limit the number of Residentiaries.

whole the tenants, no doubt, of the Church shared a full portion of the wealth of the Church, so secure and easy was their tenure; and it was not uncommon for ecclesiastics to take beneficiary leases of the lands of their own Church, which they bequeathed as property to their kindred or heirs, not unfrequently to their children. Besides this, over all their property the Church had a host of officers and retainers, stewards of their courts, receivers, proctors, lawyers, and other dependents, numberless in name and function.

But of the wealth of the Clergy, the landed property, even with the tithe, was, by no means the whole; and, invaded as it was by aggression, by dilapidation, by alienation through fraud or violence, limited in its productiveness by usage, by burthens, by generosity, by maladministration, it may be questioned whether it was the largest part. The vast treasures accumulated by the Avignonese Pontiffs when the Papal territories were occupied by enemies or adventurers, and could have yielded but scanty revenues, testify to the voluntary or compulsory tribute paid by Western Christendom to her Supreme Court of Appeal. If the Bishops mainly depended on their endowments, to the Clergy, to the monastic churches, oblations (in many cases now from free gifts hardened into rightful demands), were pouring in, and had long been pouring in, with incalculable profusion. Not only might not the altars, hardly any part of the church might be approached without a votive gift. The whole life, the death of every Christian was bound up with the ceremonial of the Church; for almost every office, was received from the rich and generous the ampler donation, from the poorer or more parsimonious was exacted the hard-wrung fee. Above all, there were the masses, which might lighten the sufferings of the soul in purgatory; there was the prodigal gift of the dying man out of selfish love for himself;[1] the more generous and no less prodigal gift of the bereaved, out of holy charity for others. The dying

[1] I am able to illustrate this from the records of St. Paul's, which have been investigated with singular industry and accuracy by my friend Archdeacon Hale, to whom I am indebted for much valuable information.

man, from the King to the peasant, when he had no further use for his worldly riches would devote them to this end;[k] the living, out of profound respect or deep affection for the beloved husband, parent, brother, kinsman, friend, would be, and actually was, not less bountiful and munificent.[m] Add to all this the oblations at the crosses of the Redeemer, or the shrines of popular and famous saints, for their intercessory prayers to avert the imminent calamity, to assuage the sorrow, or to grant success to the schemes, it might be, of ambition, avarice, or any other passion, to obtain pardon for sin, to bring down blessing: crosses and shrines, many of them supposed to be endowed with miraculous powers, constantly working miracles.[n] To most of these were made perpetual processions, led by the Clergy in their rich attire. From the basins of gold or the bright florins of the King to the mite of the beggar, all fell into the deep, insatiable box, which unlocked its treasures to the Clergy.[o]

[k] There is another curious illustration of the wealth of the Clergy. The inventory of the effects of Richard Gravesend, Bishop of London, from 1290 to 1303. It measures 28 feet in length: it gives in detail all his possessions, his chapel (plate of the chapel), jewels, robes, books, horses, the grain and stock on each of his manors, with the value of each. The total amounts to 2871*l.* 7*s.* 10½*d.* Corn was then 4*s.* per quarter.

[m] We have in St. Paul's an account of the obits or anniversaries of the deaths of certain persons, for the celebration of which bequests had been made in the fourteenth century. The number was 111. The payments made amounted in the whole to 2678*s.* 5½*d.*, of which the Dean and Canons Residentiary (present) received 1461*s.*, about 73*l.*; multiply by 15, to bring to present value, 1075*l.*

[n] E. g., Richard Preston, citizen and grocer, gave to the shrine of St. Erkenwald his best sapphire stone, for curing of infirmities of the eyes, appointing that proclamation should be made of its virtues.—Dugdale, p. 21.

[o] We have an account of the money found in the box under the great Cross on the entrance of the Cathedral (Recepta de pixide Crucis Borealis). In one month (May, A.D. 1344) it yielded no less than 50*l.* (præter argentum fractum). This was more than an average profit, but taken as an average it gives 600*l.* per annum. Multiply this by 15 to bring it to the present value of money, 9000*l.* This, by an order of the Pope's Commissary, A.D. 1410 (Dugdale, p. 20), was divided among the Dean and Canons Residentiary. But this was by no means the only box of offerings—perhaps not the richest. There was one at the magnificent shrine of St. Erkenwald; another at that of the Virgin, before which the offerings of wax tapers alone were so valuable, that the Dean and Chapter would no longer leave them to the vergers and servants of the Church. They were extinguished, carried to a room behind the chapter-house, and melted, for the use of the said Dean and Canons. Archbishop Arundel assigned to the same Dean and Canons, and to their successors for ever, the whole profits of the oblation box. Dugdale recounts gifts by King John of France, especially to the shrine of St. Erkenwald. The shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury received in one year 832*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*; in another, 954*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.* —Burnet, Hist. Reformat., vol. i. See Taylor, Index for our Lady of Walsingham. Our Chauntry accounts are full and well preserved, and would furnish a very curious illustration of the office and income of the Mass Priest.

Besides all these estates, tithes, oblations, bequests to the Clergy and the monasteries, reckon the subsidies in kind to the Mendicants in their four Orders—Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, Carmelites. In every country of Latin Christendom, of these swarms of Friars, the lowest obtained sustenance: the higher means to build and to maintain splendid churches, cloisters, houses. All of these, according to their proper theory, ought to have lived on the daily dole from the charitable, bestowed at the gate of the palace or castle, of the cottage or hovel. But that which was once an act of charity had become an obligation. Who would dare to repel a holy Mendicant? The wealth of the Mendicants was now an object of bitter jealousy to the Clergy and to the older monastic Orders. They were a vast standing army, far more vast than any maintained by any kingdom in Christendom, at once levying subsidies to an enormous amount, and living at free quarters throughout the land. How onerous, how odious they had become in England, may be seen in the prose of Wycliffe and in the poetry of Piers Ploughman.[p]

Unity of the clergy.

The Clergy, including the Monks and Friars, were one throughout Latin Christendom; and through them, to a great extent, the Latin Church was one. Whatever antagonism, feud, hatred, estrangement, might rise between rival Prelates, rival Priests, rival Orders—whatever irreconcileable jealousy there might be between the Seculars and Regulars—yet the Caste seldom, and but on rare occasions, betrayed the interests of the Caste. The high-minded Churchman, who regarded his country more than the Church, was not common; the renegade, who pursued his private interests by sacrificing those of his Order, might be more so; but he stood alone a hated and despised apostate. There might be many traitors from passion, ignorance, obstinacy, blindness to its interests—few premeditated and deliberate deserters of its cause. The Clergy in general (there were noble exceptions) were first

[p] Later, Speed, from the Supplication of Beggars, asserts, as demonstrated, that, reckoning that every householder paid the five Orders fivepence a year only, the sum of 43,000*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* was paid them by the year, besides the revenues of their own lands.

the subjects of the Pope, then the subjects of the temporal Sovereign. The Papal Legate, the Proconsul of the Pope, the co-Ruler with the King, was not dependant on the reception of a cold perhaps or hostile Court; he could almost command, rarely did not receive, the unlimited homage of the Clergy: to him was due their first obedience. The Pope claimed and long maintained the sole right of taxation of ecclesiastical property; only under his authority could that property be assessed by the State. This general taxation by the Pope began during the Crusades, for that holy purpose; it was continued for all other Crusades which he might command, and was extended to his general uses; he condescended from time to time to throw some part, in his bounty, to the temporal Sovereign;[q] but, in theory, the right was in him and in him alone. It was asserted over the whole of Christendom, and made him, as the guardian, so in some respects the Suzerain of Church property throughout the world. The allegiance of the hierarchy to the Church was at once compulsory and voluntary; the Pope's awful powers held in check the constant inevitable tendency to rebellion and contumacy, which was usually that of individual Prelates or small factions. Among themselves the Clergy could not but at times split into parties on temporal or religious subjects; but if the Papal or hierarchical authority lost ground by their turbulence or their divisions, they were soon driven back to an unanimity of dependance on the Papal power by the encroachments of the State, or to settle their own disputes. They fled from ruder tyrants to the throne of St. Peter; the Pope was at least a more impartial judge than their rival or antagonist—mostly than the civil ruler. On the whole the Order of the Clergy was one from the utmost East to the farther West, from the North to the South.

The universal fraternity of the Monastic Orders and of the Friars was even more intimate. Everywhere, from the Scottish islands to the Spanish frontier of Christendom, the Benedictine, the Clugniac, the Cistercian, might find a home; the abbey of his brethren opened to him its hos-

[q] It is curious to see the words "caritativum subsidium" creep into the more weak demands of the Popes during the schism.—MS. B. M. passim at that period.

pitable doors. This was of less importance to the elder and more sedentary Orders (they, too, travelled, a few in search of learning—most who did leave their homes, as pilgrims to Rome, to other famous shrines, or to the East); but to the wandering Friars, who spread all over Europe, of what incalculable advantage to find everywhere brethren connected with them by a closer, as they thought a holier tie, than that of kindred or consanguinity; a ready auditory prepared by the tertiaries of the Order; allies in their invasion on the parishes of the secular priests; a crowd of admirers of their learning, which added fame and so strength to their Order, and of their zeal or eloquence, which brought in new proselytes; abettors and maintainers of their influence, which was still wringing further wealth for the Order from the timid living or the remorseful dying man. This all-comprehending fraternisation had the power, and some of the mystery, without the suspicion and hatred which attaches to secret societies. It was a perpetual campaign, set in motion and still moving on with simultaneous impulse from one or from several centres, but with a single aim and object, the aggrandisement of the Society, with all its results for evil or for good.

Common language of clergy.

The Clergy had their common language throughout Western Christendom. In their intercourse with each other they needed no interpreter. This was far more than their bond; it was among the most lasting guarantees of their power. It was not from their intellectual superiority alone, but from their almost exclusive possession of the universal European language, that they held and retained the administration of public affairs. No royal Embassy was without its Prelate, even if the Ambassadors were not all Prelates, for they only could converse freely together without mutual misunderstanding of their barbarous jargon, or the precarious aid of an interpreter. The Latin alone was as yet sufficiently precise and definite in its terms to form binding treaties; it was the one language current throughout Europe; it was of necessity that of all negotiations between distant kingdoms.

Hence, too, in some respects, the Churchman was of all countries. His knowledge, at least the knowledge of the

Churchman who moved beyond the bounds of his narrow parish, of the universal Latin—the ability (in theory possessed by all) to officiate in the unchangeable service of the Church—was the only indispensable qualification for any dignity or benefice throughout Christendom. Latin Christianity had invaded the East, and planted Latin Bishops to celebrate Latin services almost throughout the Byzantine Empire. German Popes, French Popes, one English Pope, a Portuguese, a Greek or Calabrese Antipope, have occupied or have aspired to the throne of St. Peter: none of them were foreigners in tongue. All Christendom, especially England, saw their richest benefices held by strangers,[r] ignorant of the native language, and these did not always hold their remote cures as honours and appendages to their Italian dignities, but visited them at least occasionally, and had no difficulty in going through the routine of religious service.[s] There might be bitter complaints of the imperfect fulfilment of duty: conscientious men might refuse preferment among a people of strange language; but there was no legal or canonical disqualification; all that could be absolutely demanded was the ability to recite or chant the Latin breviary; no clergyman was a stranger or foreigner among the Clergy in any European kingdom.

That ubiquity of the Clergy, as belonging to one Order, under one head, under one law and discipline, speaking a common language, to a certain extent with common habits of life, was of inestimable importance, as holding together the great commonwealth of European nations, in antagonism to the Eastern races, aggregated into one horde by the common bond of the Koran. Had the Christian kingdoms grown up separate, isolated, adverse, even if each with its independent national hierarchy, still with hardly any communication but by the war of neighbouring States with neighbouring States, and with commerce restricted, precarious, unenterprising, there must have been either

[r] I have noticed (vol. iv. p. 308) the pluralist who held the archdeaconry of Thessalonica with benefices in Norfolk.

[s] Michael Scott is a rare instance of scrupulousness in refusing the Archbishopric of Cashel, on account of his ignorance of Irish. The objection does not seem to have occurred to his patron the Pope.

one vast Asiatic despotism, founded by some mighty conqueror—a Charlemagne, without his sagacious religious as well as civil organisation—or a disruption into hard repulsive masses, a shifting and conflicting aggregate of savage tribes. There could have been no confederacy to oppose the mighty invading league of Mohammedanism. Christendom could only have a religious Capital, and that Capital in all the early period was Rome; to Rome there was a constant ebb and flow from the remotest borders of Europe, and this chiefly of the Clergy; through them, knowledge, arts, whatsoever remained of the older civilisation, circulated to the extremities. The Legate, the Nuncio, if he came to bow kings and nations to an imperious yoke and to levy tribute, brought with him the peaceful pomp, the courtly manners, the knowledge, the refinement of the South: his inalienable character was that of an emissary of peace; he had no armed retainers; he found his retainers, except the few who accompanied him, in the land which he visited—the Clergy. He might, as he too often did, belie his character of the Angel of Peace;[1] he might inflame civil wars, he might even set up rebellious sons against fathers, but his ostensible office was always moderation: his progress through interjacent realms, where he passed safe, respected, honoured by the deferential veneration of all the hierarchy, was an homage to the representative of one whose office at least was to promote peace; it was an universal recognition of the blessings, the sanctity of peace. However the acts of Popes, of worldly or martial Prelates, or of a rude or fierce Clergy, might be at issue with the primal principles of the faith, yet, at the same time that they practised this wide apostacy, they condemned their own apostacy; their language could not entirely throw off, far from throwing off, it dwelt ostentatiously, though against themselves, on the true and proper aim of their interference. Where war was the universal occupation, though swept away by the torrent, they were constantly lifting up their voice against war, at least against war of Christian against Christian; they would divert the

[1] This is the title perpetually introduced into the instructions and powers given to the Cardinal or other Legates.

whole martial impulses of Christendom against the Mohammedan. Thus for centuries, through the length and breadth of Latin Christendom, was propagated and maintained, even by those who were constantly violating and weakening their own precepts, a sympathy for better and more Christian tenets—a faint yet undying echo of the angelic annunciation of Christianity, appealing to the whole Christian priesthood, and through the priesthood to universal man; "peace on earth, good will to men." Through the Hierarchy Christian Europe was one; and Christian Europe was at least brooding over the seeds of a richer harvest; it was preparing for a generous rivalry in laws, letters, arts, even in religion.

Another result of the ubiquitous Hierarchical influence, though not so much a result of its ubiquity as of its inalienable character, must not be passed by. It was not only a bond which held together the Christian nations, of different races and of different tongues, but in every nation of the Christian commonwealth the Clergy, and the Clergy alone, held together the different ranks and classes. The old Roman prejudice of the ineffaceable distinction between the free man and the slave lurked in the minds of the aristocratic Hierarchy of the South. The Clergy could not but be deeply impregnated with the feudal respect for high birth,[u] but they could not efface

Effects on social rank.

[u] In the Papal dispensations we constantly find "nobilitas generis" spoken of with "scientia and honestas;" as a justification of the permission to hold benefices in plurality.—MS. B. M. passim.

I select one illustration as in every way remarkable, not the less as proceeding from Nicolas V. It is an answer to a petition from George Neville, Canon of York, son of his beloved son Richard Earl of Salisbury. "The nobility of his descent (he was even, as he said, of royal lineage) induced the Pope to grant him a dispensation (he being fourteen years old) to hold a canonry in the Church of Salisbury, with one in York. Moreover, the gracious favour of the Pope (tuorum intuitu meritorum), the merit of a boy of fourteen! allowed him to hold those or any other two incompatible benefices, with or without cure of souls; even Parish Churches, or any dignities, below the highest; to hold them together, or to exchange them at his will during his whole life (quoad vixeris). The provision must be added, that the benefices were to be properly served, and the cure of souls not neglected."—Rome, A.D. 1447, July 7.

At twenty-three years old the same George Neville was appointed Bishop of Exeter; as he could not be consecrated for four years, he had a Bull to receive the profits.—Collier, i. 674. He was afterwards Archbishop of York. See Collier, 682. I would add on pluralities that, though not noble, Wykeham, before he was Bishop, held the archdeaconry of Buckingham, the Provostship of Wells, twelve other prebends or canonries, sacerdotiaque cum curâ plus quam satis.—Godwin, p. 286.

from the record of the faith, from the older traditions, to do them justice they never lost sight of, the saying of the Saviour, that the poor were their especial charge; poverty was, as it were, consecrated by the humble lives of the Lord and his Apostles. Many Popes have been seen rising from the meanest parentage to the Pontifical throne. In every kingdom some of the highest examples of Christian piety and ability, canonised Saints, were constantly drawn up from the humblest of mankind. Once a Churchman, the hallowed man took his position from his ecclesiastical rank, not from his birth or descent; that higher nobility had cancelled all the want of noble ancestry. There might be at some periods a closer brotherhood—a kind of separate corporate spirit—between ecclesiastics of high or generous lineage, but it rarely dared to be exclusive; other qualities, either worldly or religious, were allowed to dress the balance. The Bishop with royal blood in his veins was no more a Bishop than he who had sprung from the dregs of the people; he wore the same dress; according to his possessions, might display the same pomp; was often not less proud in the cathedral; not only in the cathedral, even in the royal Council he occupied the same seat; had almost as fair a chance of canonisation. The power of overleaping the line, which lay so broad and deep, between the high and low, the noble and the peasant, the lord and the serf, must have been a perpetual consolation and hope in the conscious abasement of the poor man and of the serf—a drop of sweetness in his bitter cup.

This, indeed, could be but the lot of few; and there might in the lower orders be much envy and jealousy of those who rose from their ranks to the height of Churchmanly dignity, as well as pride and emulation to vie with their success. Men do not always love or honour those who have outstripped them in the race of fortune or distinction; but, whether objects of envy or of encouragement, these were but rare; and most, no doubt, of the humbler classes who were admitted into the Hierarchy rose no higher than the meanest functions, or the privilege of becoming Holy Mendicants. But, in the darkest periods, when all other Christian virtues were nearly extinct,

charity, in its form of almsgiving, survived, and was strong; and, indeed, in institutions for the poor, hospitals, leper-houses, charity was not only recognised as a duty especially incumbent on Churchmen; it was a duty ostentatiously discharged. The haughtiest Pope condescended to imitate the Lord in washing the feet of poor men. Many of the most worldly Prelates were the most munificent; perhaps satisfied their consciences in the acquisition of unapostolic pomp and wealth by applying it to apostolic uses. The donation, the bequest, prodigally bestowed or ungraciously yielded by the remorseful sinner to the Priest or Bishop, as it was made to God and his Poor, however much of it might linger in the hands of the Clergy, and be applied to less hallowed purposes, nevertheless did not all lose its way; part of it strayed to its proper object—the assuagement of human indigence and misery. This was especially the case with the monastic establishments: it has been said that they were the poor-houses of the middle ages; but if poor-houses, like our own by no means wisely or providently administered, still they had those twofold blessings of acts of mercy—some softening of the heart of him who gave, some consolation to the victim, in those days probably more often of the hard times, than of his own improvidence. Latin Christianity may point to still surviving Foundations for the good—the temporal, the intellectual good—of mankind; her Hospitals and her Brotherhoods, her Universities and her Schools, her Churches and her Missions, in large part owing to the munificence or the active agency of her universal Hierarchy; and may thus calmly and securely appeal to the sentence of the most enlightened Christianity which ever, it may be hoped, will prevail in the world.

Equality of mankind.

And if the Hierarchy drew too imperiously, too sternly, too deeply the line of demarcation between the hallowed and unhallowed castes of mankind, it had the inestimable merit of asserting the absolute spiritual equality of all not in sacred orders. On the floor of the Church, before the Priest, before God (however there might be some and not always unwise distinction in place

and in the homage to rank), the King and the Serf, in all essential points, stood on the same level. The same Sacraments were the common right of all. They were baptised in the same font, heard the same masses, might listen to the same sermons, were married by the same rites, knelt at the same altar, before the throne of the same Saint, received the body and blood of the same Redeemer, were even buried (though with very different pomp of funeral) in ground equally consecrated. The only distinction was excommunication or non-excommunication. The only outlaw was, it was believed, self-outlawed by wandering beyond the pale of the Church. The faithful were one people. Who shall estimate the value, the influence, the blessing of this perpetual assertion, this visible manifestation, of the only true Christian doctrine of equality—equality before God?

One subject we would willingly decline, but the historian must not shrink from truth, however repulsive. Celibacy, which was the vital energy of the Clergy, was at the same time their fatal, irremediable weakness. One-half, at least a large portion, of human kind, could not cease to be human kind. The universal voice, which arraigns the state of morals, as regards sexual intercourse, among the Clergy, is not that of their enemies only, it is their own. Century after century we have heard throughout our history the eternal protest of the severer Churchmen, of Popes, of Legates, of Councils. The marriage, or, as it was termed, the concubinage, of the Clergy was the least evil. The example set in high places (to deny the dissoluteness of the Papal Court at Avignon, would be to discard all historical evidence) could not be without frightful influence. The Avignonese Legates bore with them the morals of Avignon. The last strong effort to break the bonds of celibacy at the council of Basle warned but warned in vain. It is the solemn attestation to the state of Germany and the northern kingdoms.[x] Even in his own age,

[x] Look back to p. 260. Before the Council of Trent, the Elector of Bavaria declared in a public document, that of 50 Clergy very few were not concubinarii.—Sarpe, viii. vii. p. 414. See for Italy references to Justiniani, Patriarch of Venice; S. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence; Weissenberg, Kirchen Versammlungen, ii. p. 229; again for Germany, ii. 228.

no doubt, Henry Bishop of Liege was a monster of depravity. The frightful revelation of his life is from an admonitory letter of the wise and good Pope Gregory X. His lust was promiscuous. He kept as his concubine a Benedictine Abbess. He had boasted in a public banquet that in twenty-two months he had had fourteen children born. This was not the worst—there was foul incest, and with nuns. But the most extraordinary part of the whole is that in the letter the Pope seems to contemplate only the repentance of the Prelate, which he urges with the most fervent solemnity. Henry's own prayers, and the intercessory prayers of the virtuous—some such, no doubt, there must be in Liege—are to work the change; and then he is to administer his Pontifical office, so as to be a model of holiness, as he had been of vice, to his subjects. As to suspension, degradation, deposition, there is not a word. The Pope's lenity may have been meant to lure him to the Council of Lyons, where he was persuaded to abdicate his See.[y] Hardly less repulsive, in some respects more so, as it embraces the Clergy and some of the convents of a whole province, is the disclosure, as undeniable and authentic, of sacerdotal morals, in the Register of the Visitations of Eudes Rigaud, Archbishop of Rouen, from 1248 to 1269.[z] We must suppose that only the Clergy of notorious and detected incontinence were presented at the Visitation. The number is sufficiently appalling: probably it comprehends, without much distinction, the married and concubinarian, as well as looser Clergy. There is one convent of females, which might almost have put Boccaccio to the blush. I am bound to confess that the Records of the Visitations from St. Paul's, some of which have been published not without reserve, too fully vindicate the truth of Langland, Chaucer, and the Satirists against the English Clergy and Friars in the fourteenth century.[a] And these

[y] "Circa divinum quoque et pontificale officium sic to sedulum et devotum exhibere" "Subditi." Henry of Liege was of princely race, of the house of Gueldres, Cousin-German to the Priest-Emperor, William of Holland: he became Bishop when a mere boy. Concilia sub ann. 1274. Hocsemius, Vit. Episcop. Leodens. p. 299.

[z] Registrum Archep. Rotomagensium, published by M. Bonnin, Rouen, 1846. It is full of other curious and less unedifying matter.

[a] Precedents in Criminal Causes

Visitations, which take note only of those publicly accused, hardly reached, if they did reach, the lowest and the loosest. Only some of the Monks, none of the Wandering Friars, were amenable to Episcopal or Archidiaconal jurisdiction. Whether we call it by the holier name of marriage, or the more odious one of concubinage, this, the weakness or the sin of the Clergy, could not be committed by the Monks and Friars. They, mostly with less education and less discipline, spread abroad through the world, had far greater temptations, more fatal opportunities. Though they had, no doubt, their Saints, not only Saints, but numberless nameless recluses of admirable piety, unimpeachable holiness, fervent love of God and of man, yet of the profound corruption of this class there can be no doubt. But Latin, Roman Christianity, would not, could not, surrender this palladium of her power.[b]

Time and the vicissitudes in political affairs had made a great difference in the power of the Clergy in the principal kingdoms of Europe. In Italy, in his double character of Italian potentate and as the Pontiff of Christendom, the Pope, after the discomfiture of the Council of Basle, had resumed in great measure his ascendancy. He now aspired to reign supreme over Letters and Arts. But from this time, or from the close of this century, the Italian Potentate, as has been said, began to predominate over the Pope. The successor of St. Peter was either chosen from one of the great Italian families, or aspired to found a great family. Nepotism became at once the strength and the infirmity, the glory and the shame, of the Papacy: the strength, as converting the Popes into the highest rank of Italian princes; the weakness, as inducing them to

edited by Archdeacon Hale, London, 1847. There is enough in these, the Visitations themselves make matters worse. It is curious that much earlier, under the reign of K. Stephen, the Dean Ralph de Diceto speaks of the "focariæ" of the canons.

[b] The Roman view is thus given in an argument before the Pope by the Cardinal de Carpi. "Del matrimonio de' Preti ne seguirà che avendo casa, moglie, figli, non dipenderanno del Papa, ma del suo Principe, e la carità della prole gli farà condescendere ad ogni pregiudizio della Chiesa; cerceranno anco di far i benefici ereditari, ed in brevissimo spatio la Sede Apostolica si ristringera a Roma. Innanzi che fosse instituto il celibato non cavava frutto alcuno la Sede Romana dell' altre città e regioni; per quello e fatta padrona de tanti benefizi, di quali il matrimonio il privarebbe in breve tempo."—Sarpi, L. v. Opere, v. ii. p. 77.

sacrifice the interests of the Holy See to the promotion of their own kindred: the glory, as seeing their descendants holding the highest offices, occupying splendid palaces, possessors of vast estates, sovereigns of principalities; the shame, as showing too often a feeble fondness for unworthy relatives, and entailing on them some complicity in the guilt, the profligacy or wickedness of their favoured kindred.

Italy.

While the Pope thus rose, the higher Prelates of Italy seemed to sink, with no loss, perhaps, of real dignity, into their proper sphere. The Archbishops of Milan, Florence, Geneva, Ravenna, are obscured before the Viscontis and Sforzas, the Medicis and Dorias, the hereditary Sovereigns, the princely Condottieri, the republican Podestàs, or the Dukes. Venice adhered to her ancient jealous policy; she would have no ambitious, certainly no foreign, Prelate within her lagunes. She was for some time content to belong to the province of an Archbishop hardly within her territory; and that Archbishop, if not a stranger within her walls, had no share in Venetian power or wealth. The single Bishop in Venice was Bishop of one of the small islands, Castello. Venice was first erected, and submitted to be erected, into a patriarchate by Nicholas V.[c] When she admitted a Bishop or a Patriarch (perhaps because no one of inferior dignity must appear in St. Mark's), that Bishop received his investiture of his temporal possessions, his ring and pastoral staff, from the Doge. No Synods could be held without permission of the Council. It was not till after her humiliation by the League of Cambray that Venice would admit the collation of Bishops to sees within her territories; even then they must be native Venetians. The Superiors of the Monasteries and Orders were Venetians. Even Papal vacancies were presented to by the Venetian Cardinals. The Republic maintained and exercised the right of censure on Venetian Bishops and on Cardinals. If they were absent or contumacious their offences were visited on their families; they were exiled, degraded, banished. The parish priests were nominated by the proprietors in the parish. There was a distinct, severe, inflexible prohibition

[c] Ughelli, Italia Sacra.

to the Clergy of all Orders to intermeddle in political affairs. Thus did Venice insulate herself in her haughty independence of Papal as of all other powers.[d] Paolo Sarpi could write, without fear of the fulminations of Rome: he had only to guard against the dagger of the papalising fanatic. There was a complete, universal toleration for foreign rites; Greek, Armenian, and Mohammedan were under protection. Prosecutions for heresy were discouraged.

Ravenna had long ceased to be the rival of Rome; the Malatestas, not the Archbishop, were her Lords. The younger branches of the great princely families, those who were disposed to ease, lettered affluence, and more peaceful pomp, by no means disdained the lofty titles, the dignity, the splendid and wealthy palaces of the Prelature: some aspired to the Popedom. Those too, and they were by no means wanting, who were possessed with a profound sense of religion, rose, from better motives and with the noblest results, to the honours of the Church. The Roman Colonnas, the Venetian Contarinis, the Lombard Borromeos, some of the holiest men, were of famous or Papal houses. The Medicis gave two Popes, Leo X. and Clement VII., princes rather than Saints, to the throne of St. Peter. Few Prelates, however, if any, excepting Popes, founded princely families. The Republics, the Tyrants who overthrew or undermined the Republics, the great Transalpine powers which warred for the mastery of Italy, warred by temporal arms alone. No Prelates took the field or plunged into politics, except the Pope and his Cardinals; even from them excommunications had lost their power. They warred with the ordinary instruments of war, soldiers, lances, and artillery. Every other Prelate was content if he could enjoy his revenues and administer his diocese in peace. In general, even the least religious, had learned the wisdom or necessity of decency; the more accomplished indulged in the patronage of letters and arts, often letters and arts Pagan rather than Christian; the truly religious rarely wrought their religion to fanati-

[d] Daru, Hist. de Venice, L. xxviii. c. xi. The saying—Siamo Venetiani, poi Christiani—was their boast or their reproach.

cism; they shone with the light of the milder virtues, and spent their superfluous wealth on churches and on ecclesiastical objects. Christian Art had its papal, its prelatical, its monastic impulses.

In France the Pragmatic Sanction, not repealed till the reign of Francis I., left the disposal of the great preferments in the power of the Crown. But, as has been said, the Pragmatic Sanction was no bold assertion of religious freedom, no generous effort for the emancipation of the universal Church. The Gallican liberties were throughout a narrow, national claim to a special and peculiar exemption from that which was acknowledged to be elsewhere an unlimited autocracy. The claim rested on its own grounds, was more endeared to France because it was distinctive; it was a perpetual appeal to the national vanity, the vindication of a privilege of which men are more fond than of a common right. As an exceptional case, though in direct contradiction with its first principle, it affirmed in all other countries the plenary indispensable power of the Pope.[e] France.

The civil wars of the Armagnacs and the Burgundians, the wars with England, threw the hierarchy of France, as it were, into the shade; more violent impulses agitated the realm than struggles for power between the Church and State.[f] The Churchmen were divided in these fatal quarrels: like the nobles of France, there were Orleanist and Burgundian Bishops. The King of England named Bishops, he had Bishops for his unscrupulous partisans, in the conquered provinces of France. It was the Bishop of Beauvais—with the Inquisitors of France—who condemned Joan of Arc as a witch, and burned her at the stake. In this wicked, contemptible, and hateful process the Church must share the guilt with England. High feudal names during all this period are found in the hierarchy of France, but the rich prelacies and abbacies had not yet become to such an extent as hereafter the appanages of the younger

[e] Gioberti has somewhere declared the Gallican Liberties a standing Anti-pope.

[f] The Parliament of Poitiers compelled Charles VII. to renounce an ordinance, Feb. 14, 1424, which they refused to register, restoring to the Pope the nomination to the Benefices. This weak concession had been obtained from the King by the Queen of Sicily. The Parliament declared the ordinance surreptitious, and contrary to the rights of the Bishops.—Ordonnances des Rois, Preface, t. xiii. Sismondi, Hist. des Français, xiii. 54.

branches of the noble families. So long as the King possessed the inappreciable prerogative of rewarding the faithful, or purchasing the wavering loyalty of those dangerous, once almost coequal, subjects by the bestowal of benefices, this power had no inconsiderable influence on the growth of the royal authority. At all events, the Church offered no resistance to the consolidation of the kingly power; the ecclesiastical nobles were mostly the obsequious partisans of the Crown.

Spain. In Spain the Church had not begun to rule her Kings with absolute sway, or rather her Kings had not yet become in mind and heart Churchmen. The Crusade still continued against the Mohammedan, who was slowly and stubbornly receding before the separate kingdoms, Castile, Arragon, Portugal. Spain had not yet begun—might seem unlikely to begin—her crusade against the rising religious liberties of Europe. She aspired not to be the Champion, and, as the Champion, the Sovereign of Latin Christendom; she had given to the Church St. Dominic, she had yet to give Ximenes, Philip II., Torquemada, Loyola.

Germany. In Germany the strife of the Papacy and the Empire seemed altogether worn out; the Emperor was content to be a German Sovereign, the Pope to leave the German sovereignty to the German Electors. The Concordat and the Articles of Aschaffenburg had established a truce which might settle down into peace. If the Pope had been satisfied to receive, Germany would hardly have been unwilling to pay, the stipulated, before long the customary, tribute. The Bishop-Electors no longer took the lead, or dictated to the Prince Electors. In general they were quietly magnificent, rather than turbulent or aggressive Prelates. Still the possession of three out of the seven suffrages for the Empire maintained at once the dignity of the Church, and made these prizes objects of ambition to the princely houses of Germany.[g] Nor did these archbishoprics stand alone. Metropolitans

g In the fifteenth century, indeed, the Bishoprics began to be commonly bestowed on the younger sons of Sovereign Princes; the Court of Rome favoured this practice, from the conviction that the Chapters could only be kept in order by the strong hand and the authority of Sovereign power, &c.—Ranke's Germany, Mrs. Austen's Translation, i. p. 68.

like those of Saltzburg, Prague, Olmutz, Magdeburg; Bishops in the flourishing cities of the Rhine, Worms, Spiers, Strasburg, or in its neighbourhood, Wurtzburg, Bamberg, Passau, Ratisbon, were, in their domains, privileges, feudal rights, and seignoralties, principalities. Yet all was apparent submission, harmony, mutual respect; perhaps the terrors of the Turkish invasion, equally formidable to Pope and Emperor, aided in keeping the peace. The balance of power was rather that of the Prince Electors and Princes of the Empire against the Emperor and the Pope, than of Emperor against Pope.[h] The estrangement from the Papal dominion, the once clamorous demand for the reformation of the Church, the yearning after Teutonic independence, had sunk into the depths of the national mind, into which it could not be followed by the most sagacious political or religious seer. The deep, silent, popular religious movement, from Master Eckhart, from the author of the Book on the Imitation of Christ, and from Tauler, above all, from the author of the German Theology and his disciples, might seem as if it was amassing strength upon the foundation of Latin Christianity and the hierarchical system; while these writers were the monitory signs, and as far as showing the uncongeniality of the Latin and Teutonic mind, the harbingers of the coming revolution.

England had long ceased to be the richest and most obedient tributary province of the Holy See. The Statutes of Mortmain, Provisors, Premunire, had become the law of the land. Peers and Commons had united in the same jealousy of the exorbitant power and influence of the Pope. The remonstrances of the Popes against these laws had broken and scattered like foam upon the rocks of English pride and English justice.[i] The Clergy, as one of the estates of the realm, hold their separate Parliament, grant their subsidies or benevolences; but they now take a

[h] Compare the Introduction of Ranke.

[i] Under Henry IV., the Parliament resolves that the Pope's collector, though he had the Pope's Bull for this purpose, hath no jurisdiction within this realm.—1 Henry IV. The Premunire is confirmed against unlawful communication with Rome, at the same time that the Act against heresy is passed; and this act is not a Canon of the Church, but a Statute of the Realm.—Parliamentary History.

humbler tone, meekly deprecate rather than fulminate anathemas against those who invade their privileges and immunities. Trembling for their own power, they care not to vindicate with offensive haughtiness that of the Pope. The hierarchy, awed by the spreading opinions of the Lollards, had thrown themselves for protection under the usurping house of Lancaster, and had been accepted as faithful allies of the Crown under Henry IV. Though the Archbishop of York is at the head of the great Northern insurrection, on Henry's side are the successive Primates of Canterbury, Arundel and Courtenay. It might seem that the Pope and the Crown, by advancing Englishmen of the noble houses to the Primacy, had deliberately determined on a league with the Lords against the civil and spiritual democracy—on one side of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw, on the other of the extreme followers of Wycliffe. The first act of this tacit league was to establish the throne of Henry Bolingbroke and put in execution the burning statute against heretics. It cannot be doubted that Archbishop Chichely, in his support of the French war, sought less to propitiate the royal favour than to discharge on France some of the perilous turbulence which was fermenting in England. At the commencement of Henry VI. the Cardinal Beaufort of Winchester is striving for supreme power with the Duke of Gloucester; but Beaufort is a Prince of the blood, uncle of the King, as well as Bishop and Cardinal.[k] In the French wars, and the civil wars, the Bishops seem to have shrunk into their proper and more peaceful sphere. Chichely was content with blowing the trumpet in the Parliament in London; he did not follow the King with the armed retainers of Canterbury. The high places of the Church—though so many of the younger as well as the elder sons of the nobility found more congenial occupation in the fields of France—

A.D. 1443. were rarely left to men of humbler birth. Stafford, who succeeded Chichely, was of the house of the

[k] Among the Ambassadors of England to Basle were the Bishops of London, Lisieux, Rochester, Bayeux, and Aix, and other English and Norman divines. —See Commission, Fuller's Church History, p. 178.

Counts of Stafford, Bourchier of the Earls of Essex.[m] Neville, brother of the Earl of Warwick, was Archbishop of York.[n] In the wars of the Roses, the Nobles, A.D. 1454. the Somersets, Buckinghams, Warwicks, Clifords—not the Canterburies, Yorks, or Londons—are at the head of the conflicting parties. The banners of Bishops and Abbots wave not over the fields of Barnet, Towton, Wakefield, St. Albans, Tewkesbury. It is not till the war is over that they resume their seat or authority in the Parliament or Council board. They acknowledge and do homage to the conqueror, York or Lancastrian, or, like Henry VII.,[o] blending the two titles. From that time the Archbishop is the first subject in the realm, but in every respect a subject. Some of the great English Prelates, from Wykeham to Wolsey, seem to have been more prescient than those in other kingdoms of the coming change. It is shown in their consecration of large masses of ecclesiastical wealth and landed property for the foundation of colleges, rather than monasteries, by Wykeham, Wainfleet, Fox, Wolsey. It can hardly be doubted that some wise Churchman suggested the noble design of Henry VI. in the endowment of Kings at Cambridge and of Eton. Wolsey's more magnificent projects seem, as it were, to be arming the Church for some imminent contest; they reveal a sagacious foreknowledge that the Church must take new ground if she will maintain her rule over the mind of man.

[m] Chichely was said to be the son of a tailor.—Fuller, p. 182. His biographer rather confirms this, speaking respectfully of it as a reputable trade, p. 3.

[n] The Pope still maintained the form of the appointment to the Primacy. As in a case cited above of York, the monks of Canterbury elected Chichely (no doubt under royal influence). The Pope refused the nomination, but himself appointed Chichely by a Papal provision. Chichely would not accept the Primacy till authorised by the King. Stafford's successor, Kemp, was in like manner elected by the monks, refused, and then nominated of his own authority by the Pope.—Godwin, in Chichely and Kemp. The Pope confirmed the election of Bourchier.—Godwin, in Bourchier. The Pope was thus content with a specious maintenance of his right, the more practical English with the possession of the real power.

[o] "This king's reign affordeth little Church storie," says Fuller. He fills it up with an account of an enormous banquet given by Neville, Archbishop of York. Neville could not help being a politician, when Edward, afterwards the IV., was a prisoner. He was in the custody of Neville, who does not seem to have watched him too carefully. Neville was seized and sent prisoner to Calais by Edward IV.

Power of hierarchy unshaken.

Still on the whole throughout Christendom the vast fabric of the hierarchy stood unshaken. In England alone there was suppressed insurrection among the followers of Wycliffe, now obscure and depressed by persecution; and in Bohemia. There the irresistible armies of Ziska and Procopius had not only threatened to found an anti-hierarchical State, but for the mutual antipathy between the Sclavonian and Teutonic races, they might have drawn Germany into the revolt. But Bohemia, again bowed under hierarchical supremacy, was brooding in sullen sorrow over her lost independence. In no other land, except in individual minds or small despised sects, was there any thought, any yearning for the abrogation of the sacerdotal authority. The belief was universal, it was a part of the common Christianity, that a mysterious power dwelt in the hierarchy, irrespective of the sanctity of their own lives, and not dependant on their greater knowledge, through study, of Divine revelation, which made their mediation absolutely necessary to escape eternal perdition and to attain eternal life. The keys were in their hands, not to unlock the hidden treasures of Divine wisdom in the Gospels, or solely to bind and loose by the administration of the great Sacraments; but the keys absolutely of Heaven or Hell. Not, indeed, that death withdrew the soul from the power of the Priest; not even after it departed from the body was it left to the unerring judgement, to the inexhaustible mercy, of the one All-seeing Judge. In purgatory the Priest still held in his hands the doom of the dead man. This doom, in the depths of the other world, was hardly a secret. The torments of purgatory (and the precincts of purgatory were widened infinitely—very few were so holy as to escape, few so desperately lost as not to be admitted to purgatorial probation) might be mitigated by the expiatory masses, masses purchased by the wealthy at the price dictated by the Priest, and which rarely could be gained without some sacrifice by the broken-hearted relative or friend. They were more often lavishly provided for by the dying sinner in his will, when wealth clung to with such desperate tenacity in life, is thrown away with as desperate recklessness. This religion, in which man

ceased to be the guardian of his own soul—with all its unspeakable terrors, with all its unspeakable consolations (for what weak mind—and whose mind on such points was not weak? would not hold as inestimable the certain distinct priestly absolution, or the prayers of the Church for the dead),—this vicarious religion was as much part of the ordinary faith, as much an article of Latin Christianity, as the retributive judgement of God, as the redemption through Christ.

It is difficult (however vain it may be) not to speculate how far the conservative reformation in the Pope and in the Hierarchy, urged so earnestly and eloquently by Gerson and D'Ailly, more vehemently and therefore more alarmingly, by the Council of Basle, might have averted or delayed the more revolutionary reform of the next century. Had not the Papacy, had not the Hierarchy, with almost judicial blindness, thrown itself across the awakening moral sense of man; had it not by the invidious possession, the more invidious accumulation, of power and wealth, with all the inevitable abuses in the acquisition, in the employment, of that power and wealth, aggravated rather than mitigated their despotic yoke; had they not by such reckless defiance as the lavish preaching of Indulgences by profligate and insolent men, insulted the rising impatience, and shown too glaringly the wide disruption and distance between the moral and the ritual elements of religion; had not this flagrant incongruity of asserting the Divine power of Christ to be vested in men, to so great an extent utterly unchristian, compelled reflection, doubt, disbelief—at length indignant reprobation—would the crisis have come when it came? Who would have had the courage to assume the responsibility for his own soul? Who would have renounced the privilege of absolution? Who would have thrown himself on the vaguer, less material, less palpable, less, may it be said, audible mercy of God in Christ, and in Christ alone? Who would have withdrawn from what at least seemed to be, what was asserted and believed to be, the visible Church, in which the signs and tokens of Divine grace and favour were all definite, distinct, cognisable by the senses; were seen, heard, felt, and not alone by the inward con-

sciousness? Who would have contented himself with being of that Invisible Church, of which the only sign was the answer of the good conscience within, faith and hope unguaranteed by any earthly mediator, unassured by any authoritative form of words or outward ceremony? Who would have rested in trembling hope on the witness of the Spirit of God, concurrent with the testimony of the spirit within? We may imagine a more noiseless, peaceful, alas, we must add, bloodless change! We may imagine the Gospel, now newly revealed, as it were, in its original language (the older Testament in its native Hebrew), and illustrated by the earlier Greek Fathers, translated into all living languages, and by the new art of Printing become of general and familiar use, gradually dispersing all the clouds of wild allegoric interpretation, of mythology, and materialism, which had been gathering over it for centuries, and thus returning to its few majestic primal truths in the Apostolic creed. We may even imagine the Hierarchy receding into their older sphere, instructors, examples in their families as in themselves, of all the virtues and charities; the religious administrators of simpler rites. Yet who that calmly, philosophically, it may almost be said religiously, surveys the power and strength of the Latin religion, the religion of centuries, the religion of a continent—its extraordinary and felicitous adaptation to all the wants and necessities of man—its sympathy with some of the dominant faculties of our being, those especially developed at certain periods of civilisation—its unity—its magisterial authority; the depth to which it had sunk in the human heart—the feelings, affections, passions, fears, hopes, which it commanded: who that surveys it in its vast standing army of the Clergy, and Monks and Friars, that had so long taken service in its defence, with its immense material strength of Churches, Monasteries, Established Laws, Rank; in its Letters, and in its Arts; in its charitable, educational, Institutions: who will not rather wonder at its dissolution, its abolition in so large a part of Christendom, than at its duration? It is not so marvellous that it resisted, and resisted with success; that it threw back in some kingdoms, for a time, the inevitable

change; that it postponed in some until a more remote, more terrible and fatal rebellion some centuries after, the detrusion from its autocratic, despotic throne. Who shall be astonished that Latin Christianity so long maintained a large part of the world at least in nominal subjection; or finally, that it still maintains the contest with its rival Teutonic Christianity without, and the more dangerous, because unavowed, revolt within its own pale—the revolt of those who, in appearance its subjects, either altogether disdain its control, and, not able to accept its belief and discipline, compromise by a hollow acquiescence, or an unregarded, unpunished neglect of all discipline, for total inward rejection of belief?

CHAPTER II.

BELIEF OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

Unity of creed.

LATIN Christendom, or rather universal Christendom, was one (excepting those who were self-outlawed, or outlawed by the dominant authority from the Christian monarchy), not only in the organisation of the all-ruling Hierarchy and the admission of Monkhood, it was one in the great system of Belief. With the exception of the single article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Nicene formulary had been undisturbed, and had ruled with undisputed sway for centuries. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as the Father was undoubtedly the doctrine of the early Latin writers; but this tenet stole noiselessly—it is not quite certain at what time—into the Creed. That Creed, framed at the great Council of Nicea, had been received with equal unanimity by the Greek and Latin Churches. Both Churches had subscribed to the anathemas pronounced by the second Council of Constantinople, and ratified by the first Council of Ephesus, against any Church which should presume to add one word or letter to that Creed. Public documents in Rome showed that Pope Leo III. had inscribed on a silver tablet the Creed of Rome without the words "from the Son," as the authorised faith of the Latin Church. In the great quarrel with Photius, the Greeks discovered, and charged against the Latins, this audacious violation of the decrees of the Councils, this unauthorised impious addition to the unalterable Creed of Nicea. The Patriarch of Constantinople charged it, justly or unjustly, against his own enemy, Nicolas I.[a] In the strife with Michael Cerularius, at

Procession of the Holy Ghost.

[a] I know no more brief or better summary of the controversy than the common one in Pearson on the Creed. I have some doubts whether the accusation of Photius, as to its introduction, is personal against Pope Nicolas or against the Roman Church.

the final disruption between the two Churches, this was one of the inexpiable offences of the Latin Church. The admission of the obnoxious article by the Greeks at the Council of Florence was indignantly repudiated, on the return of the Legates from the Council, by the Greek Church. But the whole of Latin Christendom disdained to give ear to the protest of the Greeks; the article remained, with no remonstrance whatever from the West, in the general Latin Creed. A.D. 1053.

But the Creeds—that of the Apostles, that of Nicea, or even that ascribed to St. Athanasius, and chanted in every church of the West—formed but a small part of the belief of Latin Christendom. That whole world was one in the popular religion. The same vast mythology commanded the general consent; the same angelology, demonology; the same worship of the Virgin and the Saints, the same reverence for pilgrimages and reliques, the same notions of the life to come, of Hell, Purgatory, Heaven. In general, as springing out of like tendencies and prepossessions of mind, prevailed the like or kindred traditions; the world was one in the same vulgar superstitions. Already, as has been seen, at the close of the sixth century, during the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, the Christianisation not only of the speculative belief of man, of that which may justly be called the religion of man, was complete: but no less complete was the Christianisation, if it may be so said, of the lingering Paganism. Man had divinised all those objects of awe and veneration, which rose up in new forms out of his old religion, and which were intermediate between the Soul and God, "God," that is, "in Christ," as revealed in the Gospels. Tradition claimed equal authority with the New Testament. There was supposed to be a perpetual power in the Church, and in the Hierarchy the Ruler and Teacher of the Church, of infinitely expanding and multiplying the objects of faith; at length, of gradually authorising and superinducing as integral parts of Christianity the whole imaginative belief of the Middle Ages. Even where such belief had not been canonically enacted by Pope or Council, the tacit acceptance by the general prac- Unity of popular religion.

tice of Priest as well as of people, was not less authoritative; popular adoration invested its own objects in uncontested sanctity. Already the angelic Hierarchy, if not in its full organisation, had taken its place between mankind and God; already the Virgin Mary was rising, or had fully risen, into Deity; already prayers rarely ascended directly to the throne of grace through the one Intercessor, a crowd of mediate agencies was almost necessary to speed the orison upward, and to commend its acceptance, as it might thwart its blessing. Places, things, had assumed an inalienable holiness, with a concentered and emanative power of imparting or withholding spiritual influences. Great prolific principles had been laid down, and had only to work in the congenial soil of the human mind. Now, by the infusion of the Barbaric or Teutonic element, as well as by the religious movement which had stirred to its depths the old Roman society, mankind might seem renewing its youth, its spring-time of life, with all its imaginative creativeness, and its unceasing surrender to whatever appeared to satisfy the yearnings of its hardly satisfied faith.

There was unity in the infinite diversity of the popular worship. Though each nation, province, parish, shrine, had its peculiar and tutelar Saint, none was without a Saint, and none denied the influence of the Saints of others. Christianity was one in this materialistic intercommunion between the world of man and the extramundane; that ulterior sphere, in its purer corporeity, yet still, in its corporeity, was perpetually becoming cognisable to the senses of man. It was one in the impersonation of all the agencies of nature, in that universal Anthropomorphism, which, if it left something of vague and indefinite majesty to the Primal Parental Godhead, this was not from any high intellectual or mental conception of the incongruity of the human and divine; not from dread of the disparagement of the Absolute and the Infinite; from no predilection for the true sublimity of higher Spiritualism; but simply because its worship, content to rest on a lower sphere, humanised all which it actually adored, without scruple, without limit; and this not in language only, but in its highest conception of its real existence.

All below the Godhead was materialised to the thought. Even within the great Triune Deity the Son still wore the actual flesh which he had assumed on earth; the Holy Ghost became a Dove, not as a symbol, but as a constantly indwelt form. All beyond this supercelestial sphere, into which, however controversial zeal might trespass, awful reverence yet left in some majestic indistinctness, and some confessed mysterious transcendentalism; all lower, nearer to the world of man, angels and devils, the spirits of the condemned and the beatified Saints, were in form, in substance however subtilised, in active only enlarged powers, in affections, hatred or attachment, in passions, nothing more than other races of human beings.

There was the world of Angels and of Devils. The earlier faith, that of Gregory the Great, had contented itself with the notions of Angels as dimly revealed in the Scriptures. It may be doubted if any names of angels, except those in the Sacred Writings, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, or any acts not imagined according to the type and precedent of the angelic visitations in the Old and New Testament, will be found in the earlier Fathers. But by degrees the Hierarchy of Heaven was disclosed to the ready faith of mankind, at once the glorious type and with all the regular gradations and ranks of the Hierarchy upon Earth. There was a great celestial Church above, not of the beatified Saints, but of those higher than human Beings whom St. Paul had given some ground to distinguish by different titles, titles which seemed to imply different ranks and powers. Angels.

Latin Christendom did not give birth to the writer who, in this and in another department, influenced most powerfully the Latin mind. The author of those extraordinary treatises which, from their obscure and doubtful parentage, now perhaps hardly maintain their fame for imaginative richness, for the occasional beauty of their language, and their deep piety—those treatises which, widely popular in the West, almost created the angel-worship of the popular creed, and were also the parents of Mystic Theology and of the higher Scholasticism—this Poet-Theologian was a Greek.* The writings which bear the venerable name of

Dionysius the Areopagite, the proselyte of St. Paul, first appear under a suspicious and suspected form, as authorities cited by the heterodox Severians in a conference at Constantinople.[b] The orthodox stood aghast: how was it that writings of the holy Convert of St. Paul had never been heard of before? that Cyril of Alexandria, that Athanasius himself, were ignorant of their existence? But these writings were in themselves of too great power, too captivating, too congenial to the monastic mind, not to find bold defenders.[c] Bearing this venerable name in their front, and leaving behind them, in the East, if at first a doubtful, a growing faith in their authenticity,[d] they appeared in the West as a precious gift from the Byzantine Emperor to the Emperor Louis the Pious. France in that age was not likely to throw cold and jealous doubts on writings which bore the hallowed name of that great Saint, whom she had already boasted to have left his primal bishopric of Athens to convert her forefathers, whom Paris already held to be her tutelar Patron, the rich and powerful Abbey of St. Denys to be her founder. There was living in the West, by happy coincidence, the one man who at that period, by his knowledge of Greek, by the congenial speculativeness of his mind, by the vigour and richness of his imagination, was qualified to translate into Latin the mysterious doctrines of the Areopagite, both as to the angelic world and the subtle theology. John Erigena hastened to make known in the West the "Celestial Hierarchy," the treatise "on the Name of God," and the brief chapters on the "Mystic Philosophy." These later works were more tardy in their acceptance, but perhaps more enduring in their influence. Traced downwards through Erigena himself, the St. Victors,

Dionysius the Areopagite.

[b] Concilia sub ann. 533. Compare the Preface to the edition of Corderius.

[c] Photius, in the first article in his Bibliotheca, describes the work of a monk, Theodorus, who had answered four out of the unanswerable arguments against their authenticity, as the writings of the Areopagite; but about the answers of Theodorus, and his own impression of the authority and value of the books, Photius is silent.—Photii Biblioth. p. 1, ed. Bekker.

[d] There is a quotation from them in a Homily of Gregory the Great, Lib. ii. Hom. 34, Oper. i. p. 1607. Gregory probably picked it up during his controversy in Constantinople.—(See vol. i. p. 435.) There is no other trace of an earlier version, or of their earlier influence in the West.

Bonaventura, to Eckhart and Tauler in Germany, and throughout the unfailing succession of Mystics, they will encounter us hereafter.[e]

The "Celestial Hierarchy" would command at once, and did command, universal respect for its authority, and universal reverence for its doctrines. The "Hierarchy" threw upward the Primal Deity, the whole Trinity, into the most awful, unapproachable, incomprehensible distance; but it filled the widening intermediate space with a regular succession of superhuman Agents, an ascending and descending scale of Beings, each with his rank, title, office, function, superior or subordinate. The vague incidental notices in the Old and New Testament (in St. Paul, and to St. Paul doubtless Jewish tradition lent the names) were wrought out into regular Orders, who have each, as it were, a feudal relation, pay their feudal service (here it struck in with the Western as well as with the Hierarchical mind) to the Supreme, and have feudal superiority or subjection to each other. This theory ere long became almost the authorised Theology; it became, as far as such transcendent subjects could be familiarised to the mind, the vulgar belief. The Arts hereafter, when mature enough to venture on such vast and unmanageable subjects, accepted this as the tradition of the Church. Painting presumed to represent the individual forms, and even, in Milton's phrase, "the numbers without number" of this host of heaven. The Celestial Hierarchy.

The Primal Godhead, the Trinity in Unity, was alone Absolute, Ineffable, Inconceivable; alone Essential Purity, Light, Knowledge, Truth, Beauty, Goodness.[f] These qualities were communicated in larger measure in proportion to their closer approximation to itself, to the three descending Triads which formed the Celestial Hierarchy:—I. The Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones. II. The Domina-

[e] The Preface of Corderius (Observat. xi.) briefly shows the connection of the pseudo-Dionysius with Scholasticism, especially with Thomas Aquinas.—Observat. xii. shows the innumerable references of Aquinas to those works; yet Aquinas was far less mystic than other schoolmen.

[f] The writer strives to get beyond Greek copiousness of expression, in order to shroud the Godhead in its utter unapproachableness. He is the Goodness beyond Goodness, ὑπερἀγαθος ἀγαθότης, the Super-Essential Essence, οὐσια ὑπερούσια, Godhead of Godhead, ὑπερθεος Θεότης.

tions, Virtues, Powers. III. Principalities, Archangels, Angels. This Celestial Hierarchy formed, as it were, concentric circles around the unapproachable Trinity. The nearest, and as nearest partaking most fully of the Divine Essence, was the place of honour. The Thrones, Seraphim, and Cherubim approximated most closely, with nothing intermediate, and were more immediately and eternally conformed to the Godhead. The two latter of these were endowed, in the language of the Scripture, with countless eyes and countless wings.[g] The second Triad, of less marked and definite attributes, was that of the Powers, Dominations, Virtues.[h] The third, as more closely approximating to the world of man, if it may be so said, more often visited the atmosphere of earth, and were the immediate ministers of the Divine purposes. Yet the, so-called, Areopagite laboriously interprets into a spiritual meaning all the forms and attributes assigned in the sacred writings to the Celestial Messengers, to Angels and Archangels. They are of fiery nature. Fire possesses most properties of the Divinity, permeating everything, yet self pure and unmingled: all manifesting, yet undiscernible till it has found matter to enkindle; irresistible, invisible, subduing everything to itself; vivifying, enlightening, renewing, and moving and keeping everything in motion; and so through a long list of qualities, classed and distinguished with exquisite Greek perspicuity. He proceeds to their human form, allegorising, as he goes on, the members of the human body, their wings, their partial nakedness, their bright or their priestly raiment, their girdles, their wands, their spears, their axes, their measuring-cords, the winds, the clouds, the brass and tin, the choirs and hallelujahs, the hues of the different precious stones; the animal forms of the lion, the ox, the eagle, the horse; the colours of the symbolic horses; the streams, the chariots, the wheels, and finally, even the joy of the

[g] Πρωτὴν μὲν εἶναι φησι, τὴν περὶ Θεὸν οὖσαν ἀεί, καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμέσως ἡνῶσθαι παραδεδομένην, τοὺς τὶ γὰρ ἀγιωτάτους ἐρόνους καὶ τὰ πολυόμματα καὶ πολύπτερα πήγματα Χερουβὶμ, Ἑβραίων φωνῇ, καὶ Σεραφὶμ ὠνομάσμενα.—C. vi.

[h] All this was said to be derived from St. Paul. Gregory the Great (Lib. ii. Moralia) has another distribution, probably from some other source.

Angels.[1] All this, which to the wise and more reflective seemed to interpret and to bestow a lofty significance on these images, taken in its letter—and so far only it reached the vulgar ear—gave reality, gave a kind of authority and conventional certainty to the whole Angelic Host as represented and described for the popular worship. The existence of this regular Celestial Hierarchy became an admitted fact in the higher and more learned Theology; the Schoolmen reason upon it as on the Godhead itself: in its more distinct and material outline it became the vulgar belief. The separate and occasionally discernible Being and Nature of Seraphim and Cherubim, of Archangel and Angel, in that dim confusion of what was thought revealed in the Scripture, and what was sanctioned by the Church — of image and reality; this Oriental, half Magian, half Talmudic, but now Christianized theory, took its place, if with less positive authority, with hardly less questioned credibility, amid the rest of the faith.

But this, the proper, if it may be so said, most heavenly, was not the only Celestial Hierarchy. There was a Hierarchy below, reflecting that above; a mortal, a material Hierarchy: corporeal, as communicating divine light, purity, knowledge to corporeal Beings. The triple earthly Sacerdotal Order had its type in heaven, the Celestial Orders their antitype on earth. The triple and novene division ran throughout, and connected, assimilated, almost identified the mundane and supermundane Church. As there were three degrees of attainment, Light, Purity, Knowledge (or the divine vision), so there were three Orders of the Earthly Hierarchy, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; three Sacraments, Baptism, the Eucharist, the Holy Chrism; three classes, the Baptised, the Communicants, the Monks. How sublime, how exalting, how welcome to the Sacerdotalism of the West this lofty doctrine! The Celestial Hierarchy were as themselves; themselves were formed and organised after the pattern of the great Orders in heaven. The whole worship of Man, in

Celestial Hierarchy.

[1] Ch. xv.

which they administered, was an echo of that above; it represented, as in a mirror, the angelic or superangelic worship in the Empyrean. All its splendour, its lights, its incense, were but the material symbols; adumbrations of the immaterial, condescending to human thought, embodying in things cognisable to the senses of man the adoration of the Beings close to the throne of God.[k]

The unanswerable proof, were other wanting, of the Greek origin of the Celestial Hierarchy is, that in the Hierarchical system there is no place for the Pope, nor even—this perhaps might seem more extraordinary to the Gallic Clergy—for the Metropolitan. It recognises only the triple rank of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Jesus to the earthly Hierarchy is as the higher Primal Godhead, as the Trinity, to the Celestial Hierarchy. He is the Thearchic Intelligence, the supersubstantial Being.[m] From him are communicated, through the Hierarchy, Purity, Light, Knowledge. He is the Primal Hierarch, that imparts his gifts to men; from him and through him men become partakers in the Divinity. The Sacraments are the channels through which these graces, Purification, Illumination, Perfection, are distributed to the chosen. Each Hierarchical Order has its special function, its special gifts. Baptism is by the Deacon, the Eucharist by the Priest, the Holy Chrism by the Bishop. What the Celestial Hierarchy are to the whole material universe the Hierarchy of the Clergy are to the souls of men; the transmittants, the sole transmittants, of those graces and blessings which emanate from Christ as their primal fountain.

Still, however, as of old,[n] angelic apparitions were rare and unfrequent in comparison with the dæmoniacal possessions, the dæmoniacal temptations and interferences. Fear was more quick, sensitive, ever-awake, than wonder, devotion, or love. Men might in their

Dæmonology.

[k] Ἐπεὶ μηδὲ δυνατὸν ἐστιν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς νοΐ, πρὸς τὴν αὐλὸν ἐκείνην ἀνατιθῆναι τῶν οὐρανίων Ἱεραρχιῶν μίμησίν τε καὶ θεωρίαν, εἰ μὴ τῇ κατ' αὐτον ὑλαίᾳ χειραγωγίᾳ χρήσαιτο τὰ μὲν φαινόμενα κάλλη τῆς ἀφανοῦς ἐμπρεπείας ἀπεικονίσματα λογιζόμενος, καὶ τὰς αἰσθητὰς ἐνωδίας ἐκτυπώματα τῆς νοητῆς διαδοσίως. καὶ τὴς αὐλου φωτοδοσίας εἴκοτα τὰ ὑλικὰ φώτα.—Lib. i. c. i. p. 3.

[m] Θειαρχικώτατος νοῦς, ὑπερουσίος.

[n] Compare vol. i. p. 469.

profound meditations imagine this orderly and disciplined Hierarchy far up in the remote Heavens. The visitations to earth might be of higher or lower ministers, according to the dignity of the occasion or the holiness of the Saint. The Seraphim might flash light on the eye, or touch with fire the lip of the Seer; the Cherubim might make their celestial harmonies heard; the Archangel might sweep down on his terrible wings on God's mission of wrath; the Angel descend on his more noiseless mission of love. The air might teem with these watchful Beings, brooding with their protecting care over the Saints, the Virgins, the meek and lowly Christians.[o] They might be in perpetual contest for the souls of men with their eternal antagonists the Devils. But the Angelology was but dim and indistinct to the dreadful ever-present Dæmonology; their name, the Spirits of Air, might seem as if the atmosphere immediately around this world was their inalienable, almost exclusive domain.

So long as Paganism was the antagonist of Christianity, the Devil, or rather the Devils, took the names of Heathen Deities: to St. Martin of Tours, they were Jove, Mercury, Venus, or Minerva. They wore the form and the attributes of those rejected and degraded Gods, no doubt familiar to most by their statues, perhaps by heathen poetry—the statues not yet destroyed by neglect or by Christian Iconoclasm, the poetry, which yet sounded to the Christian ear profane, idolatrous, hateful.[p] At a later period the Heathen Deities have sunk into the obscure protectors of certain odious vices. Among the charges against Pope Boniface VIII. is the invocation of Venus and other Pagan dæmons, for success in gambling and other licentious occupations. So, too, in the conversion of the Germans, the Teutonic

[o] Spenser's beautiful and well-known lines express the common feeling.

[p] Nam interdum in Jovis personam, plerumque Mercurii, persæpe etiam se Veneris ac Minervæ transfiguratum vultibus offerebat.—Sulp. Sever. Vit. S. Mat. cxxiii. Martin was endowed with a singular faculty of discerning the Devil. "Diabolum vero tam conspicabilem et subjectum oculis habebat, ut sive se in propriâ substantiâ contineret, sive in diversas figuras spiritualesque nequitias transtulisset, qualibet ab eo sub imagine videretur." Once Martin promised the Devil the Divine forgiveness at the Day of Judgement, on his ceasing to persecute, and his repentance of his sins. "Ego tibi vero confisus in Domino, Christi misericordiam pollicebor." The heterodox charity of St. Martin did not meet the same aversion as the heterodox theology of Origen.

Gods became Dæmons. The usual form of recantation of heathenism was, "Dost thou renounce the Devils? Dost thou renounce Thonar, Woden, Saxnote?"[q] "Odin take you," is still the equivalent in some Northern tongues to "the Devil take you."[r]

But neither did the Greek Mythology, nor did that of the Germans, offer any conception like that of the later Jewish and the Christian Antagonist of God. Satan had no prototype in either. The German Teufel (Devil) is no more than the Greek Diabolus. The word is used by Ulphilas; and in that primitive translation Satan retains his proper name.[s] But as in Greek and Roman heathenism the infernal Deities were perhaps earlier, certainly were more universally, than the deities of Olympus, darkened into the Dæmons, Fiends, Devils of the Christian belief; so from the Northern mythology, Lok and Hela, before and in a greater degree than Odin or the more beneficent and warlike Gods, were relegated into Devils. Pluto was already black enough, terribly hideous enough, cruel and unrelenting enough; he ruled in Tartarus, which was, of course, identified with Hell: so Lok, with his consummate wickedness, consummate wiliness, as the enemy of all good, lent and received much of the power and attributes of Satan.

The reverent withdrawal not only of the Primal Parental Godhead, the Father, but likewise of the two co-eternal Persons of the Trinity into their unapproachable solitude, partly perhaps the strong aversion to Manicheism, kept down, as it were, the antagonism between Good and Evil into a lower sphere. The Satan of Latin Christianity was no Eastern, almost coeval, coequal Power with Christ; he was the fallen Archangel, one it might be of the highest, in that thrice-triple Hierarchy of Angelic Beings. His mortal enemy is not God, but St. Michael. How completely this was the popular belief may appear from one illustration, the Chester Mystery of the Fall of Lucifer.[t]

[q] See vol. ii. p. 434.

[r] Grimm. Mythologie, p. 568.

[s] Mark iii. 23. John xiii. 27. Edit. Zahn.

[t] Thus speaks Lucifer to the Celestial Hierarchy:

Destres, I commaunde you for to cease,
And see the bewtye that I beare,
All Heaven shines through my brightnes,
For God himself shines not so clear.
Chester-Mysteries, p. 13.

This drama, performed by the guilds in a provincial city in England, solves the insoluble problem of the origin of Evil through the intense pride of Lucifer. God himself is present on the scene; the nine Orders remonstrate against the overweening haughtiness of Lucifer, who, with his Devils, is cast down into the dark dungeon prepared for them.

But in general the sublimity even of this view of the Antagonist Power of Evil mingles not with the popular conception. It remained for later Poetry: it was, indeed, reserved for Milton to raise his image of Satan to appalling grandeur; and Milton, true to tradition, to reverential feeling, to the solemn serene grandeur of the Saviour in the Gospel, leaves the contest, the war with Satan, to the subordinate Angels and to Michael, the Prince of the Angels. The Son, as coequal in Godhead, sits aloof in his inviolate majesty.[u]

Devils.

The Devil, the Devils of the dark ages, are in the vulgar notion something far below the Lucifer, the fallen Son of the Morning. They are merely hideous, hateful, repulsive—often, to show the power of the Saint, contemptible. The strife for the mastery of the world is not through terrible outbursts of power. The mighty destructive agencies which war on mankind are the visitations of God, not the spontaneous, inevitable, or even permitted devastations of Satan. It is not through the loftier passions of man, it is mostly by petty tricks and small annoyances, that the Evil One endeavours to mislead or molest the Saint. Even when he offers temptations on a larger scale, there is in general something cowardly or despicable; his very tricks are often out-tricked. The

[u] Remark Milton's wonderful sublimity, not merely in his central figure of him, who had not "lost all his original brightness," who was "not less than archangel ruined," but in his creation, it may almost be said, out of Selden's book, and the few allusions in the Old Testament, of a new Demonology. He throws aside the old Patristic Hierarchy of Devils, the gods of Greece and Rome, whom the revival of classical literature had now reinstated in their majesty and beauty, as seen in the Poets. He raises up in their stead the biblical adversaries of the Godhead of the Old Testament; the Deities of the nations, Canaan and Syria, circumjacent and hostile to the Jews. Before Milton, if Moloch, Belial, Mammon, were not absolutely unknown to poetry, they had no proper and distinct poetic existence. I owe the germ of this observation, perhaps more than the germ, to my friend Mr. Macaulay.

form which he assumed, the attributes of the form, the horns, the tail, the cloven foot, are vulgar and ludicrous. The stench which betrays his presence; his howlings and screechings are but coarse and grovelling. At first, indeed, he was hardly permitted to assume the human form:[x] his was a monstrous combination of all that was most ugly and hateful in the animal shape. If Devils at times assumed beautiful forms, as of wanton women to tempt the Saints, or entered into and possessed women of attractive loveliness, it was only for a time; they withdrew and shrunk back to their own proper and native hideousness.

Even Dante's Devils have but a low and menial malignity; they are base and cruel executioners, torturers, with a fierce but dastardly delight in the pains they inflict. The awful and the terrible is in the human victims: their passions, their pride, ambition, cruelty, avarice, treachery, revenge, alone have anything of the majesty of guilt; it is the diabolic in man, not the Devils acting upon men and through men, which makes the moral grandeur of his Inferno.

The Serpent.

The symbol under which the Devil, Satan as Lucifer, as well as his subordinate fiends, are represented throughout this period, the Serpent, was sometimes terrific, often sunk to the low and the ludicrous. This universal emblem of the Antagonist Power of Evil runs through all religions,[y] (though here and there the Serpent is the type of the Beneficent Deity, or, coiled into a circular ring, of eternity.)[z] The whole was centered in the fearful image of the great Dragon in the Apocalypse. St.

[x] Alors qu'aux yeux du vulgaire celui-ci fut devenu un être hideux, incohérent assemblage des formes les plus animales, et les plus effrayantes; un personnage grotesque à force d'être laid. —Maury, Légendes Pieuses, p. 198.

M. Maury says that the most ancient representation of the Devil in human form is in an ivory diptych of the time of Charles the Bald, p. 136, note. See also text.

[y] The connexion of the Dragon, Serpent, and Worm with the Devil in its countless forms is traced with inexhaustible learning by M. Maury, in his Légendes Pieuses, pp. 131. 154. So too the growth of each dæmoniac beast out of other notions, the lion, the wolf, the swine. It would be impossible to enter in such a work as this into the endless detail.

[z] The ample references of M. Maury on this subject might be enlarged. See the work of Mr. Deane on the Worship of the Serpent.

Michael slaying the Dragon is among the earliest emblems of the triumph of Good over Evil. From an emblem it became a religious historical fact. And hence, doubtless, to a great extent, the Dragon of Romance; St. George is but another St. Michael of human descent. The enmity of the serpent to the race of man, as expressed and seemingly countenanced by the Book of Genesis, adds wiliness to the simply terrible and destructive monster. Almost every legend teems with serpent dæmons. Serpents are the most dire torturers in hell. The worm that never dyeth (Dante's great Worm) is not alone; snakes with diabolic instincts, or snakes actually Devils, and rioting in the luxury of preying on the vital and sensitive parts of the undying damned, are everywhere the dreadful instruments of everlasting retribution.

Closely connected with these dæmoniac influences was the belief in magic, witchcraft, spells, talismans, conjurations. These were all the actual delusions or operations of obedient or assistant Evil Spirits. The Legislature of the Church and of the State, from Constantine down to a late period, the post-Papal period of Christianity; Roman, Barbarian, even modern Codes, recognised as real facts all these wild hallucinations of our nature, and by arraying them in the dignity of heretical impious and capital offences, impressed more deeply and perpetuated the vulgar belief. They have now almost, but by no means altogether, vanished before the light of reason and of science. The most obstinate fanaticism only ventures to murmur, that in things so universally believed, condemned by Popes and Councils, and confirmed by the terrible testimony of the excommunication and the execution of thousands of miserable human beings, there must have been something more than our incredulous age will acknowledge.[a] Wisdom and humanity may look with patience, with indulgence, with sympathy, on many points of Christian superstition, as bringing home to hearts which would otherwise have been untouched, unsoftened, unconsoled, the blessed influences and peace of religion; but on this sad chapter,

[a] See Görres, Christliche Mystik, that strange erudite rhapsody, which, with all its fervour, fails to convince us that the author was in earnest.

extending far beyond the dark ages, it will look with melancholy, indeed, but unmitigated reprobation. The whole tendency was to degrade and brutalise human nature: to degrade by encouraging the belief in such monstrous follies, to brutalise by the pomp of public executions, conducted with the solemnity of civil and religious state.

All this external world-environing world of Beings possessed the three great attributes, ubiquity, incessant activity with motion in unappreciable time, personality. God was not more omnipresent, more all-knowing, more cognisant of the inmost secrets of the human heart than were these angelic or dæmon hosts. These divine attributes might be delegated, derivative, permitted for special purposes; but human fear and hope lost sight of this distinction, and invested every one of the countless præternatural agents in independent, self-existent, self-willed life. They had, too, the power of assuming any forms; of endless and instantaneous transmutation.

But the Angels were not the only guardians and protectors of the faithful against the swarming, busy, indefatigable malignant spirits, which claimed the world of man as their own. It might seem as if human weakness required something less impalpable, more sensibly real, more akin to itself, than beings of light and air, which encircled the throne of God. Those Beings, in their essence immaterial, or of a finer and more ethereal matter, might stoop to earth, or might be constantly hovering between earth and heaven; but besides them, as it were of more distinct cognisance by man, were those who, having worn the human form, retained it, or reassumed it, as it were clothing over their spiritualised being. The Saints, having been human, were more easily, more naturally conceived, as still endowed with human sympathies; intermediate between God and man, but with an imperishable ineffaceable manhood more closely bound up with man. The doctrine of the Church, the Communion of Saints, implied the Church militant and the Church triumphant. The Christians yet on earth, the Christians already in heaven, formed but one polity; and if there was this kindred, if it may be so said, religious consanguinity, it

The Saints.

might seem disparagement to their glory and to their union with Christ to banish them to a cold unconscious indifference, and abase them to ignorance of the concerns of their brethren still in the flesh. Each saint partook, therefore, of the instinctive omniscience of Christ. While unabsorbed in the general beatified community, he kept up his special interest and attachment to the places, the companions, the fraternities of his earthly sojourn; he exercised, according to his will, at least by intercession, a beneficent influence; he was tutelar within his sphere, and therefore within that sphere an object of devout adoration. And so, as ages went on, saints were multiplied and deified. I am almost unwilling to write it; yet assuredly, hardly less, if less than Divine power and Divine will was assigned by the popular sentiment to the Virgin and the Saints. They intercepted the worship of the Almighty Father, the worship of the Divine Son. To them, rather than through them, prayer was addressed; their shrines received the more costly oblations; they were the rulers, the actual disposing Providence on earth: God might seem to have abandoned the Sovereignty of the world to these subordinate yet all-powerful agencies.

High above all this innumerable Host of Saints and Martyrs, if not within the Trinity (it were not easy, if we make not large allowance for the wild language of rapturous adoration, to draw any distinction), hardly below, was seated the Queen of Heaven.[b] The worship of the Virgin, since the epoch of Gregory the Great, had been constantly on the ascendant; the whole progress of Christian thought and feeling converged towards this end.[c] The passionate adoration of the Virgin was among the causes of the discomfiture of Nestorianism—the discomfiture of Nestorianism deepened the passion. The title "Mother of God" had been the

b At qualis currus, cujus aurigæ sunt immortales Spiritus!
Qualis illa quæ ascendit, et cui Deus fit obvius!
Hæc est Regina naturæ, et pæne gratiæ.
Tali pompâ excipienda est quæ Deum exceperat.
Adsurge, anima, dic aliquid sublimius.
Ante adventum Mariæ regnabant in cœlo tres personæ.
Nec (et?) regnabant tres Reges.
Alterum thronum addidit homo Deus;
Adventante Maria tertius thronus est additus.
Et nunc triplex in cœlo regnum est, ubi erat unicum.
Sedet proxima Deo mater Dei.
Labbé in Elogiis. Comp. Augusti, v. iii. p. 55.

c Compare on the earlier period Beugnot, Destruction du Paganisme, ii. 267. The whole subject of the progress of the worship of the Virgin, in Augusti, Denkwurdigkeiten, iii. pp. 1, *et seqq.*, with ample illustrations.

watchword of the feud; it became the cry of victory. Perhaps as the Teutonic awe tended to throw back into more remote incomprehensibility the spiritual Godhead, and therefore the more distinct human image became more welcome to the soul; so perhaps the purer and loftier Teutonic respect for the female sex was more prone to the adoration of the Virgin Mother. Iconoclasm, as the images of the Virgin Mother, then perhaps usually with the Child, were more frequent and regarded with stronger attachment, would seem a war specially directed against the blessed Mary; her images, when they rose again, or, as was common, smiled again on the walls, would be the objects of still more devout wonder and love. She would vindicate her exalted dignity by more countless miracles, and miracles would be multiplied at once by the fanatic zeal and by the more easy credulity of her triumphant worshippers; she would glorify herself, and be glorified without measure. It was the same in the East and in the West. The East had early adopted in the popular creed the groundwork, at least, of the Gospel of the Infancy and of the other spurious Gospels, which added so prodigally to the brief allusions to the Mother in the genuine Gospels.[d] The Emperor Heraclius, it has been seen, had the Virgin on his banner of war; to the tutelar protection of the Virgin Constantinople looked against the Saracen and the Turk. Chivalry above all would seem, as it were, to array the Christian world as the Church militant of the Virgin.[e] Every knight was the sworn servant of our Lady; to her he looked for success in battle—strange as it may sound, for success in softer enterprises.[f] Poetry took even more irreverent license; its adoration in its intensity became revoltingly profane. Instead of hallowing human passion, it brought human passion into the sphere of adoration, from which it might have been expected to shrink with instinctive modesty. Yet it must be known in its utmost phrenzy to be judged rightly.[g]

[d] Perhaps the reception of these into the Koran as part of the universal Christian belief is the most striking proof of this.

[e] On the chivalrous worship of the Virgin, Le Grand d'Aussy, Fabliaux, v. 27.

[f] The poetry of the Troubadours is full of this.

[g] C'est ainsi que le même Gautier (de

So completely was this worship the worship of Christendom, that every cathedral, almost every spacious church, had its Chapel of our Lady. In the hymns to the Virgin, in every breviary, more especially in her own "Hours" (the great universal book of devotion), not merely is the whole world and the celestial world put under contribution for poetic images, not only is all the luxuriance and copiousness of language exhausted, a new vocabulary is invented to express the yet inexpressible homage; pages follow pages of glowing similitudes, rising one above another. In the Psalter of the Virgin almost all the incommunicable attributes of the Godhead are assigned to her; she sits between Cherubim and Seraphim; she commands, by her maternal influences, if not by authority, her Eternal Son.[h] To the Festivals of the Annunciation and the Purification (or the Presentation of Christ in the Temple) was added that of the Assumption of the Virgin.[i] A rich and copious legend revealed the whole history of her birth and life, of which the Sacred Scriptures were altogether silent, but of which the spurious Gospels furnished many incidents,[k] thus, as it were, taking their rank as authorities with the Apostolic four. And all this was ere long to be embodied in Poetry, and, it might seem, more imperishably in Art. The latest question raised about the Virgin—her absolute immunity from the sin of Adam—is the best illustration of the strength and vitality of the belief. Pious men could endure the discussion. Though St. Bernard, in distinct words which cannot be

Coron.) conçut pour la Vierge Marie un amour véritable, qui l'enflamma, le dévora toute sa vie. Elle était pour lui ce qu'est une amante pour le plus passionné des hommes. Il réunissait pour elle toutes les beautés qu'il apercevait dans les religieuses d'un couvent qu'il dirigeait; lui adressait chaque jour des vers pleins d'amour, d'érotiques chansons; il la voyait dans ses rêves, et quelquefois même quand il veillait, sous les formes les plus voluptueuses, et la croyait l'héroïne des mille aventures, que, dans son délire, il inventait, et puis racontait en vers innumérables.—Hist. Littéraire de la France, xix. p. 843.

To purify his imagination from this, let the reader turn to Petrarch's noble ode "Virgine bella, che di sol vestita."

[h] Excelsus super Cherubim Thronus ejus, et sedes ejus super cardines cœli.—Ps. cxlii. Domina Angelorum, regina Mundi!—Ps. xxxix. Quod Deus imperio, tu prece, Virgo, facis—Jure matris impera filio!

[i] Titian's Assumption of the Virgin at Venice, to omit the Murillos, and those of countless inferior artists.

[k] See these Gospels in Thilo Codex Apocryphus.

explained away, had repudiated the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin.[m]—though it was rejected by Thomas Aquinas,[n] that Conception without any taint of hereditary sin, grew up under the authority of the rival of Aquinas. It became the subject of contention and controversy, from which the calmer Christian shrinks with intuitive repugnance. It divided the Dominicans and Franciscans into hostile camps, and was agitated with all the wrath and fury of a question in which was involved the whole moral and religious welfare of mankind.[o] None doubted[p] that it was within the lawful sphere of theology.[q] Wonderful as it may seem, a doctrine rejected at the end of the twelfth century by the last Father of the Latin Church, has been asserted by a Pope of the nineteenth, and a Council is now sitting in grave debate in Rome on the Immaculate Conception.[r]

The worship of the Saints might seem to be endangered by their multiplicity, by their infinity. The crowded calendar knew not what day it could assign to the new Saint without clashing with, or dispossessing, an old one; it was forced to bear an endless accumulation on some favoured days. The East and the West vied with each other in their fertility. The Greek Menologies are not only as copious in the puerility and trivialness of their

[m] Mariam in peccato conceptam, cum et ipsa vulgari modo per libidinem maris et fœminæ concepta est. One is almost unwilling to quote in Latin what St. Bernard wrote. Ad canon. Lugdun. It is true St. Bernard made a vague submission on this, as on other points, to the judgement of the Church.

[n] Summa Theologiæ, iii. 27, and in coarse terms.

[o] When the stranger travelling in Spain arrived at midnight at a convent-gate, and uttered his "Santissima Virgen," he knew by the answer, either "Sin pecado concebida," or by the silence with which the door opened, whether it was a Franciscan or a Dominican.

[p] Singular it may seem, the doctrine was first authorised by the reforming heterodox? Council of Basle, A.D. 1439. Session xxv. vi.

[q] Even such a writer as Augustin Theiner *was*, can write such pages as appear in the Vie de Clement XIV., i. p. 341.

[r] Is there not wisdom enough in the Church, which has never been thought wanting in wisdom, to consider whether it is wise to inflame a passionate paroxysm of devotion in a very few; and to throw back, by an inevitable revulsion, and by so fatal an argument placed in their hands, multitudes into utter unbelief and contempt of all religion?—So had I written in 1854: the Council has passed its decree; to all who own its authority the Immaculate Conception is admitted, or, what is very different, not denied to be an Article of the Christian creed. But is not the utter and total apathy with which it has been received (one day's Spectacle at Rome, and nearly silent indifference throughout Christendom) the most remarkable sign of the times—the most unanswerable proof of the prostration of the strength of the Roman Church? There is not life enough for a schism on this vital point.

wonders, they even surpass the Western Hagiologies. But of the countless Saints of the East, few comparatively were received in the West. The East as disdainfully rejected many of the most famous, whom the West worshipped with the most earnest devotion; they were ignorant even of their names. It may be doubted if an Oriental ever uttered a prayer in the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Still that multiplicity of Saints, as it bore unanswerable witness to the vigour of the belief, so also to its vitality. It was constantly renewing its youth by the elevation of more favourite and recent objects of adoration. Every faculty, every feeling, every passion, every affection, every interest was for centuries in a state of perpetual excitement to quicken, keep alive, and make more intense this wonder-fed and wonder-seeking worship. The imagination, the generous admiration of transcendent goodness, of transcendent learning, or, what was esteemed even more Christian, transcendent austerity; rivalry of Church with Church, of town with town, of kingdom with kingdom, of Order with Order; sordid interest in the Priesthood who possessed, and the people who were permitted to worship, and shared in the fame, even in the profit, from the concourse of worshippers to the shrine of a celebrated Saint; gratitude for blessings imputed to his prayers, the fruitful harvest, protection in war, escape in pestilence; fear lest the offended Saint should turn away his face; the strange notion that Saints were under an obligation to befriend their worshippers; the still bolder Brahminical notion that Saints might be compelled, by the force of prayer, or even by the lavish oblation, to interpose their reluctant influence;—against all this stood one faculty of man alone, and that with difficulty roused out of its long lethargy, rebuked, cowed, proscribed, shuddering at what might be, which was sure to be, branded as impiety—the Reason. Already in the earliest period to doubt the wild wonders related of St. Martin of Tours is to doubt the miracles of the Gospel.[s] Popular admiration for some time enjoyed,

[s] Quanquam minimè mirum sit si in operibus Martini infirmitas humana dubitaverit, cum multos hodieque videamus, nec Evangelicis quidem credidisse.—Sulp. Sever., Dial. ii. 15. Sulpicius almost closes the life of St. Martin with these words: "De cætero si quis infideliter legerit, ipse peccabit."

unchecked, the privilege of canonisation. A Saint was a Saint, as it were, by acclamation; and this acclamation might have been uttered in the rudest times, as during the Merovingian rule in France; or within a very limited sphere, as among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, so many of whose Saints were contemptuously rejected by the Norman Conqueror. Saints at length multiplying thus beyond measure, the Pope assumed the prerogative of advancing to the successive ranks of Beatitude and Sanctity. If this checked the deification of such perplexing multitudes, it gave still higher authority to those who had been recognised by more general consent, or who were thus more sparingly admitted to those honours of Beatification and Sanctification (those steps, as it were, of spiritual promotion were gradually introduced). The Saints ceased to be local divinities; they were proclaimed to Christendom, in the irrefragable Bull, as worthy of general worship.[t]

Canonisation.

There were some, of course the universal Saints of Christendom, the Apostles, the early martyrs; some of Latin Christendom, the four great Fathers of the Latin Church; some few, like St. Thomas of Canterbury, the martyr of the ecclesiastical Order, would be held up by the whole Hierarchy as the pattern and model of sanctity. St. Benedict, in all the Benedictine monasteries, the founders or reformers of the Monastic Institutes, St. Odo, St. Stephen Harding, St. Bernard, St. Romuald, St. Norbert; at a later period, above all, wherever there were Mendicant Friars (and where were there not?), St. Dominic and St. Francis would have their images raised, their legends read and promulgated with the utmost activity, and their shrines heaped with offerings. Each Order was bound especially to hold up the Saints of the Order; it was the duty of all who wore the garb to spread their fame with special assiduity.[u] The Dominicans and Franciscans

[t] Canonisation has been distributed into three periods. Down to the tenth century the Saint was exalted by the popular voice, the suffrage of the people with the Bishop. In the intermediate period the sanction of the Pope was required, but the Bishops retained their right of initiation. Alexander III. seized into the hands of the Pope alone this great and abused Prerogative.—Mabillon, Act. S. Benedict V. in Præf.

[u] The great authority for the Lives of

could boast others besides their founders: the Dominicans the murdered Inquisitor Peter the Martyr, and St. Thomas Aquinas; the Franciscans St. Antony of Padua, and San Bonaventura. Their portraits, their miracles, were painted in the churches, in the cloisters of the Friars; hymns in their name, or sentences, were chanted in the services. All these were world-wide Saints: their shrines arose in all lands, their churches or chapels sprung up in all quarters. Others had a more limited fame, though within the pale of that fame their worship was performed with loyal fidelity, their legend read, their acts and miracles commemorated by architecture, sculpture, painting. As under the later Jewish belief each Empire had its guardian Angel, so each kingdom of Christendom had its tutelar Saint. France had three, who had each his sacred city, each, as it were, succeeded to, without dispossessing, the other. St. Martin of Tours was the older; St. Remi, who baptised Clovis into the Catholic Church, had an especial claim on all of Frankish descent. But, as Paris rose above Tours and Rheims, so rose St. Denys, by degrees, to be the leading Saint of France. St. Louis was the Saint of the royal race.[x] St. Jago of Compostella, the Apostle St. James, had often led the conquering Spaniard against the Mussulman. The more peaceful Boniface, with others of the older missionaries, was honoured by a better title in Germany. Some of the patron Saints, however, of the great Western kingdoms are of a later period, and sprung probably out of romance, perhaps were first

the Saints, of course with strong predilection for the Saints of the West, is the vast Collection of the Bollandists, even in the present day proceeding towards its termination. On the origin and the writers of this Collection, consult Pitra, Etudes sur la Collection des Actes des Saints par les Jésuites Bollandistes. To me the whole beauty and value is in the original contemporary form (as some, for instance, are read in Pertz, Monumenta Germaniæ). In the Bollandists, or even in the Golden Legend of Jacob a Voragine, they become cold and controversial; the original documents are overlaid with dissertation. Later writers, like Alban Butler, are apologetic, cautious, always endeavouring to make the incredible credible. In the recent Lives of the English Saints, some of them admirably told, there is a sort of chilly psychological justification of belief utterly irreconcileable with belief; the writers urge that we ought to believe, what they themselves almost confess that they can only believe, or fancy they believe, out of duty, not of faith.

[x] Charlemagne was a Saint (Baronius, sub ann. 814). He was unfortunately canonised by a Pseudo-Pope (Pascal). He was worshipped at Aix-la-Chapelle, Hildesheim, Osnaburg, Minden, Halberstadt—thus a German rather than a French Saint. See the Hymn to him, Daniel, i. p. 305, from the Halberstadt Breviary.

inscribed on the banners to distinguish the several nations during the Crusades. For the dignity of most of these Saints there is sufficient legendary reason: as of St. Denys in France, St. James in Spain, St. Andrew in Scotland (there was a legend of the Apostle's conversion of Scotland), St. Patrick in Ireland. England, however, instead of one of the old Roman or Saxon Saints, St. Alban, St. Augustine, placed herself under the tutelar guardianship of a Saint of very doubtful origin, St. George.[y] In Germany alone, notwithstanding some general reverence for St. Boniface, each kingdom or principality, even every city, town, or village, had its own Saint. The history of Latin Christianity may be traced in its more favoured Saints, first Martyrs, then Bishops, then Fathers, Jerome, Augustin, Gregory, then Monks (the type St. Benedict). As the Church grew in wealth, Kings or Nobles, magnificent donors, were the Saints; as it grew in power, rose Hierarchical Saints, like Becket. St. Louis was the Saint of the Crusades and Chivalry; St. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura of Scholasticism. Female prophets might seem chosen to vie with those of the Fraticelli and of the Heretics; St. Catherine of Sienna, St. Bridget[z] (those Brides of Christ), who had constant personal intercourse with the Saints, with the Virgin, with our Lord himself. In later days Christian charity, as well as Mysticism, had its Saints, St. Vincent de Paul, with St. Teresa, and St. Francis de Sales.

To assert, to propagate the fame, the miracles, of his proper Saint was the duty of every King, of every burgher, of every parishioner, more especially of the Priesthood in

[y] Dr. Milner (the Roman Catholic) wrote an Essay against Gibbon's assertion that "the infamous George of Cappadocia became the patron Saint of England." He was, I think, so far successful; but it is much more easy to say who St. George was not than who he was.

[z] St. Bridget was beatified by Boniface IX., canonised by John XXIII. at the Council of Constance, confirmed by St. Martin. The Swedes were earnest for their Saint (and she had had the merit of urging the return of the Popes from Avignon). But Gerson threw some rationalising doubts on the visions of St. Bridget, and on the whole bevy of female Saints, which he more than obviously hinted might be the dupes or accomplices of artful Confessors. The strange wild rhapsodies, the visions of St. Bridget, under the authority of Turrecremata, were avouched by the Council of Basle. See Gerson's Tracts, especially de probatione spirituum, de distinctione verarum visionum a falsis.—Helyot, iv. p. 25. Shröeck, xxxiii. p. 189, &c.

the Church dedicated to his memory, which usually boasted of his body buried under the high altar, or of reliques of that body. Most churches had a commemorative Anniversary of the Saint, on which his wonders were the subjects of inexhaustible sermons. It was the great day of pomp, procession, rejoicing, feasting, sometimes rendered more attractive by some new miracle, by some marvellous cure, some devil ejected, something which vied with or outdid the wonders of every neighbouring Saint. Of old, the Saint-worshippers were more ambitious. In the days of St. Martin, Sulpicius Severus urges on his friend Posthumianus to publish everywhere, in his distant travel or on his return from the East, the fame of St. Martin.[a] "Pass not Campania; make him known to the holy Paulinus, through him it will be published in Rome, in Italy, and in Illyricum. If you travel to the right, let it be heard in Carthage, where he may rival Cyprian; if to the left, in Corinth, who will esteem him wiser than Plato, more patient than Socrates. Let Egypt, let Asia hear the fame of the Gaulish Saint." That, however, was when Saints were rare. More restricted commerce, and the preoccupation of every land, every city, every church with its own patron Saint, confined within the province, city, or hamlet, all who had not some universal claim to respect or some wide-spread fraternity to promulgate their name. Yet though there might be jealousy or rivalry in the worship of distant or neighbouring Saints; yet as the heathens denied not the gods of other nations, even hostile nations, whom themselves did not worship as gods; so none would question the saintship, the intercessory powers, the marvels of another Saint.

Thus throughout Christendom was there to every community and every individual man an Intercessor with the one Great Intercessor between God and man, some intermediate being, less awful, more humble, whose office, whose charge, almost whose duty it was to speed, or who, if offended, might withhold the suppliant orison. Every one of these Saints had his life of wonder,

Legends.

[a] Dum recurris diversasque regiones, loca, portus, insulas, urbesque præter legis, Martini nomen et gloriam sparge per populos.—V. S. Martini, Dialog. iii. p. 583.

the legend of his virtues, his miracles, perhaps his martyrdom, his shrines, his reliques. The legend was to his votaries a sort of secondary Gospel, wrought into the belief by the constant iteration of its names and events. The legend, in truth, was the dominant, universal poetry of the times. Unless it had been poetry it had not ruled the mind of man; but, having been poetry, it must submit to remain poetry. It is the mythic literature of Christendom,[b] interminable in its extent; but, as its whole life is in its particularity, it suffers and withers into dulness by being brought into a more compendious form; and so it is that Hagiography has withdrawn into its proper domain, and left the province of human affairs to history, which is not disdainful, of course, of the incidental information or illustration of events, manners, characters, which transpire through the cloud of marvels. Even the philosophy of history endeavours only to divine how men believed, or believed that they believed, this perpetual suspension or abrogation of the laws of nature; how that which was then averred on the authority of experience has now fallen into neglect as contrary to all experience: so that even the most vigorous attempt to reinstate them is received as a desperate, hardly serious, effort of paradoxical ingenuity, falls dead on the general mind, hardly provokes scorn or ridicule, and, in fact, is transcended in interest by every transitory folly or new hallucination which seems to be the indispensable aliment required by some part of mankind in the highest as in the lowest social or intellectual state.

The legend was perpetually confirmed, illustrated, kept alive by the substantial, if somewhat dimly and mysteri-

[b] M. Maury's work, "Les Légendes Pieuses," has exhausted the subject. The more cautious readers must be warned that M. Maury carries up his system, where few Christians will follow him, with hardly less audacity than Strauss himself, into the Scriptural narratives. But while we admit that the desire of conformity with the Life of the Saviour suggested a great part of the incidents, and that the Gospel miracles suggested the miracles of the later Saints—the originality, the truth, the unapproachable dignity of the Gospel type is not only unimpaired, but to me becomes only more distinct and real. There is an intimate harmony, no where else found, between the moral and the supernatural. The line appears in my judgement broad and clear; and those who, like the modern advocates for the belief of the middle ages, resolve the whole into the attainment of a proper frame of mind to receive legend as truth, seem to me to cut up altogether all belief in miracle.

Compare some good observations of M. Ampère, Leçon XIV.

ously shown, reliques which were either in the church, under the altar, or upon the altar; the treasure of the community, or the property, the talisman of the prelate, the noble, or the king. The reliquary was the most precious ornament in the lady's chamber, in the knight's armoury, in the king's hall of state, as well as in that of the Bishop or the Pope. Our history has perhaps dwelt on reliques with sufficient frequency. Augustine, in the earlier times, had reproved the wandering monks who made a trade of selling martyrs' limbs, if indeed they are the limbs of martyrs.[a] The Theodosian Code had prohibited the violation of the tombs of the martyrs, and the removal and sale of their bodies.[d] Gregory the Great had reproved the Greek practice of irreverently disinterring and sending about the bodies of Saints; he refused to the Empress of Constantinople reliques of St. Paul.[e] We have seen with what jealous parsimony he distributed the filings of the chains of St. Peter.[f] But, as the world darkened, these laws fell into desuetude: the first reverential feelings died away. In truth, to the multiplication, dissemination, veneration of reliques conspired all the weaknesses, passions, innate and seemingly unextinguishable propensities of mankind; the fondness for cherishing memorials of the beloved, in human affection so excusable, so amiable, how much more so of objects of holy love, the Saints, the Blessed Virgin, the Saviour himself! the pride of possessing what is rare; the desire to keep alive religious associations and religious thoughts; the ignorance of the priesthood, the pious fraud of the priesthood, admitted to be Christian virtue in order to promote devotion and so the spiritual welfare of man. Add to all this the inherent indefeasible power ascribed to reliques to work miracles. No wonder that with the whole Christian world deeming it meritorious and holy to believe, dangerous, impious to doubt, there should be no end or limit to belief; that the wood of the true Cross should grow into a forest; Reliques.

[a] De oper. Monachorum, c. 8.

[d] Humanum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat, nemo martyrem detrahat, nemo mercetur.

[e] Ad Imperat. Constant.—Compare Act. Ordinis S. Benedicti II. Præf. xxx.

[f] Vol. i. p. 471.

that wild fictions, the romance of the Wise Men of the East transmuted into kings, the Eleven Thousand Virgins, should be worshipped in the rich commercial cities on the Rhine; that delicacy and even reverence should not take offence, as at the milk of the Blessed Virgin; that the most perishable things should become imperishable, the garments of the Saviour and the Saints. Not even the fiercest feuds could detect imposture. Tours and Poitiers quarrelled for the body of St. Martin; St. Benedict was stolen away from Italy: we have seen the rejoicing at his arrival in France; and the expedition sent by Eginhard to Italy in search of pious plunder. There were constant wars between monastery and monastery; marauding campaigns were carried on against some neighbouring treasure-house. France was smitten with famine, because Clotaire II. cut off and stole an arm of St. Denys, under the instigation of the Devil.[g] It was virtue in St. Ouen to steal the head of St. Marculph. But as to disputing the genuineness, unless of rival reliques, or questioning their wonder-working power, it never entered into the profane thought of man. How the Crusades immeasurably increased the wealth of Western Christendom in reliques, how they opened an important branch of traffic, needs no further illustration. To the very verge of our historic period the worship of reliques is in its unshaken authority. At the close of the fourteenth century the Duke of Berry obtains a piece of the head of St. Hilary of Poitiers as a most splendid present for the city of Poitiers from the Abbey of St. Denys;[h] he had already obtained the chin. The exhibition of the Holy Coat of Treves—a treasure possessed by more than one other Church, and more than one avouched by Papal authority—may show how deep-rooted in human nature is this strange form of religiousness. One of the most remarkable illustrations

[g] Annales Dagobert. Herman Corner gives the price of some relics. Egilmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, bought for his Church (A.D. MXXI.) an arm of St. Augustine, at Pavia, for 100 talents of pure silver and one of gold.

[h] Particulam quandam capitis ejus sancti, a parte posteriori versus aurem dextram ad modum trianguli, in longitudine et latitudine spacium trium digitorum.—Rel. de St. Denys, xiv. 16. The mutilation seems not to have been thought irreverent.

of relique-worship occurs after the close of our history, during the pontificate of Æneas Sylvius, Pius II. The head of St. Andrew (Amalfi boasted the immemorial possession of the body) had been worshipped for centuries at Patras. As the Turks advanced in the Morea, the fugitive Despot would not leave this precious treasure exposed to the profane insults of the unbelievers. He carried it with him in his flight. Kings vied for the purchase; vast sums were offered. The Pope urged upon the Despot that he could not permit such a relique to repose anywhere but at Rome. The head of St. Andrew should rest by that of his brother St. Peter; the Saint himself would resist any other arrangement. The Despot arrived at Ancona with his freight. It was respected by the stormy seas. A Cardinal of the most blameless life was chosen to receive and inspect the relique; by what signs he judged the head to be that of St. Andrew we know not. But Romagna was in too dangerous a state to allow it at once to be transported to Rome; the fierce Piccinino or the atheist Malatesta would not have scrupled to have seized it for their own use, worshipped it, or sold it at an exorbitant price. It was conveyed for security to the strong fortress of Narni. When Piccinino's forces were dispersed, and peace restored, it was brought in stately procession to Rome. It was intended that the most glorious heads of St. Peter and St. Paul should go forth to meet that of their brother Apostle. But the vast mass of gold which enshrined, the cumbrous iron which protected, these reliques were too heavy to be moved: so without them the Pope, the Cardinals, the whole population of Rome thronged forth to the meadows near the Milvian Bridge. The Pope made an eloquent address to the head; a hymn was sung, entreating the Saint's aid in the discomfiture of the Turks. It rested that day on the altar of St. Maria del Popolo, was then conveyed through the city, decorated with all splendour (the Jubilee under Nicolas V. saw not Rome more crowded), to St. Peter's. Cardinal Bessarion preached a sermon; the head was deposited with those of his brother Apostles under the high altar.[1]

[1] Commentarii Pii II.

Throughout the middle ages the world after death continued to reveal more and more fully its awful secrets. Hell, Purgatory, Heaven became more distinct, if it may be so said, more visible. Their site, their topography, their torments, their trials, their enjoyments, became more conceivable, almost more palpable to sense: till Dante summed up the whole of this traditional lore, or at least, with a Poet's intuitive sagacity, seized on all which was most imposing, effective, real, and condensed it in his three co-ordinate poems. That Hell had a local existence, that immaterial spirits suffered bodily and material torments; none, or scarcely one hardy speculative mind, presumed to doubt.[k] Hell had admitted, according to legend, more than one visitant from this upper world, who returned to relate his fearful journey to wondering man: St. Fiercy,[m] St. Vettin,[n] a layman Bernilo.[o] But all these early descents interest us only as they may be supposed or appear to have been faint types of the great Italian Poet. Dante is the one authorised topographer of the mediæval Hell.[p] His originality is no more called in question by these mere signs and manifestations of the popular belief than by the existence and reality of those objects or scenes in external nature which he describes with such unrivalled truth.[q] In Dante meet unreconciled

Hell.

[k] Scotus Erigena, perhaps alone, dared to question the locality of Hell, and the material tortures of the damned. Diversas suppliciorum formas non localiter in quadam parte, veluti toto hujus visibilis creaturæ, et ut simpliciter dicam neque intra diversitatem totius naturæ a Deo conditæ futuras esse credimus; et neque nunc esse, et nusquam et nunquam. The punishment in which Erigena believed was terrible remorse of conscience, the sense of impossible repentance or pardon. At the final absorption of all things, that genuine Indian absorption, derived from his master the Pseudo-Dionysius, evil and sin would be destroyed for ever, not evil ones and sinners. Erigena boldly cites Origen, and extorts from other authorities an opinion, to the same effect, of the final salvation, the return unto the Deity, of the Devil himself. There is nothing eternal but God. Omne quod æternum in Deo solummodo intelligi; nec ulla æternitas extra eum qui solus est æternus et æternitas. He thus gets rid of all relating to eternal fire. Read the remarkable passage in the 5th book de Natura, from the xxvth. at least to xxxvith. chapters.

[m] Bede, iii. 19. Mabillon, Acta S. Benedicti, iii. 307. The Bollandists, Jan. ii. p. 44.

[n] Mabillon, iv. 272.

[o] Flodoard, iii. 3.

[p] See Damiani's Hell and Heaven, iv. Ep. xiv. viii. 2; also vol. ii. p. 425. Consult also Cædmon.

[q] There is a strange book written at the beginning of the seventeenth century, "De Inferno," by Antonio Rusca (Milan, 1621). It is dedicated with fearful simplicity to our Saviour. It settles gravely, logically, as it would be supposed authoritatively, and not without erudition, every question relating to Hell and its Inhabitants, its place, extent, divisions, torments.

(who thought of or cared for their reconciliation?) those strange contradictions, immaterial souls subject to material torments; spirits which had put off the mortal body, cognisable by the corporeal sense.[r] The mediæval Hell had gathered from all ages, all lands, all races, its imagery, its denizens, its site, its access, its commingling horrors; from the old Jewish traditions, perhaps some from regions beyond the sphere of the Old Testament from the Pagan poets, with their black rivers, their Cerberus, their boatman and his crazy vessel; perhaps from the Teutonic Hela, through some of the earlier visions. Then came the great Poet, and reduced all this wild chaos to a kind of order, moulded it up with the cosmical notions of the times, and made it, as it were, one with the prevalent mundane system. Above all, he brought it to the very borders of our world; he made the life beyond the grave one with our present life; he mingled in close and intimate relation the present and the future. Hell, Purgatory, Heaven were but an immediate expansion and extension of the present world. And this is among the wonderful causes of Dante's power, the realising the unreal by the admixture of the real: even as in his imagery the actual, homely, everyday language or similitude mingles with and heightens the fantastic, the vague, the transmundane. What effect had Hell produced, if peopled by ancient, almost immemorial objects of human detestation, Nimrod or Iscariot, or Julian or Mohammed? It was when Popes all but living, Kings but now on their thrones, Guelfs who had hardly ceased to walk the streets of Florence, Ghibellines almost yet in exile, revealed their awful doom—this it was which, as it expressed the passions and the fears of mankind of an instant, immediate, actual, bodily, com-

[r] This was embarrassing to the philosophic heathen. "Tantum valuit error, ut corpora cremata cum scirent, tamen ea fieri apud inferos fingerent, quæ sine corporibus nec fieri possunt nec intelligi. Animos enim per seipsos viventes non poterant mente complecti, formam aliquam figuramque quærebant."—Cicer. Tusc. i. c. 16. Rusca lays it down as the Catholic doctrine, "Docet tamen Catholica veritas, infernum malorum carcerem esse locum quendam materialem et corporeum." l. c. xxviii. The more enlightened Peter Lombard speaks of "non corporalem, sed corpori similem." Souls were borne bodily to Heaven by visible Angels, fought for by visible Devils. See the battle for the Soul of King Dagobert. Maury, p. 80.

prehensible place of torment: so, wherever it was read, it deepened that notion, and made it more distinct and natural. This was the Hell, conterminous to the earth, but separate, as it were, by a gulph passed by almost instantaneous transition, of which the Priesthood held the keys. These keys the audacious Poet had wrenched from their hands, and dared to turn on many of themselves, speaking even against Popes the sentence of condemnation. Of that which Hell, Purgatory, Heaven were in popular opinion during the Middle Ages, Dante was but the full, deep, concentered expression; what he embodied in verse all men believed, feared, hoped.

Purgatory.

Purgatory had now its intermediate place between Heaven and Hell, as unquestioned, as undisturbed by doubt; its existence was as much an article of uncontested popular belief as Heaven or Hell. It were as unjust and unphilosophical to attribute all the legendary lore which realised Purgatory, to the sordid invention of the Churchman or the Monk, as it would be unhistorical to deny the use which was made of this superstition to exact tribute from the fears or the fondness of mankind. But the abuse grew out of the belief; the belief was not slowly, subtly, deliberately instilled into the mind for the sake of the abuse. Purgatory, possible with St. Augustine,[8] probable with Gregory the Great, grew up, I am persuaded (its growth is singularly indistinct and untraceable), out of the mercy and modesty of the Priesthood. To the eternity of Hell torments there is and ever must be—notwithstanding the peremptory decrees of dogmatic theology and the reverential dread in so many religious minds of tampering with what seems the language of the New Testament—a tacit repugnance. But when the doom of every man rested on the lips of the Priest, on his absolution or refusal of absolution, that Priest might well tremble with some natural awe—awe not confessed to himself—at dismissing the soul to an irrevocable, unrepealable, unchangeable destiny. He would not be averse to pronounce a more mitigated, a reversible sentence. The keys of

[8] De fide et oper., c. 16. On Gregory, see note, vol. i. p. 474.

Heaven and of Hell were a fearful trust, a terrible responsibility; the key of Purgatory might be used with far less presumption, with less trembling confidence. Then came naturally, as it might seem, the strengthening and exaltation of the efficacy of prayer, of the efficacy of the religious ceremonials, of the efficacy of the sacrifice of the altar, and the efficacy of the intercession of the Saints: and these all within the province, within the power of the Sacerdotal Order. Their authority, their influence, their intervention closed not with the grave. The departed soul was still to a certain degree dependent upon the Priest. They had yet a mission, it might be of mercy; they had still some power of saving the soul after it had departed from the body. Their faithful love, their inexhaustible interest might yet rescue the sinner; for he had not reached those gates—over which alone was written, "There is no Hope" —the gates of Hell. That which was a mercy, a consolation, became a trade, an inexhaustible source of wealth. Praying souls out of Purgatory by Masses said on their behalf, became an ordinary office, an office which deserved, which could demand, which did demand, the most prodigal remuneration. It was later that the Indulgence, originally the remission of so much penance, of so many days, weeks, months, years; or of that which was the commutation for penance, so much almsgiving or munificence to churches or Churchmen, in sound at least extended (and mankind, the high and low vulgar of mankind, are governed by sound) its significance: it was literally understood, as the remission of so many years, sometimes centuries, of Purgatory.[t]

Masses.

Indulgences.

If there were living men to whom it had been vouchsafed to visit and to return and to reveal the secrets of remote and terrible Hell, there were those too who were admitted in vision, or in actual life to more

[t] Unde quibusdam in locis concedebantur tandem expressæ indulgentiæ a *pœnâ et a culpâ*, licet quidam summi Pontifices absurdum censuisse videntur aliquas indulgentias a pœnâ et a culpâ esse nominandas, cum a solo Deo culpa deleatur; et indulgentia est remissio pœnæ temporalis, . . . Unde quidam concessiones hujusmodi magis deceptiones quam indulgentiarum concessiones interpretantes cum eas intentu lucri temporalis fieri judicabant, dicere non timebant, anima nostra nauseat super cibo levissimo.—Gobelinus Persona, p. 320. This was in Germany during the Schism, above a century before Luther.

accessible Purgatory, and brought back intelligence of its real local existence, and of the state of souls within its penitential circles. There is a legend of St. Paul himself; of the French monk St. Farcy; of Drithelm, related by Bede; of the Emperor Charles the Fat, by William of Malmesbury. Matthew Paris relates two or three journeys of the Monk of Evesham, of Thurkill, an Essex peasant, very wild and fantastic. The Purgatory of St. Patrick, the Purgatory of Owen Miles, the vision of Alberic of Monte Casino, were among the most popular and wide-spread legends of the ages preceding Dante; and as in Hell, so in Purgatory, Dante sums up in his noble verses the whole theory, the whole popular belief as to this intermediate sphere.[u]

Heaven.

If Hell and Purgatory thus dimly divulged their gloomy mysteries, if they had been visited by those who returned to actual life, Heaven was unapproached, unapproachable. To be rapt to the higher Heaven remained the privilege of the Apostle; the popular conception was content to rest in modest ignorance. Though the Saints might descend on beneficent missions to the world of man; of the site of their beatitude, of the state of the Blest, of the joys of the supernal world, they brought but vague and indefinite tidings. In truth, the notion of Heaven was inextricably mingled up with the astronomical and cosmogonical as well as with the theological notions of the age. Dante's Paradise blends the Ptolemaic system with the nine angelic circles of the Pseudo Dionysius; the material heavens in their nine circles; above and beyond them, in the invisible heavens, the nine Hierarchies; and yet higher than the highest heavens the dwelling of the Ineffable Trinity. The Beatific Vision, whether immediate or to await the Last Day, had been eluded rather than determined, till the rash and presumptuous theology of Pope John XXII. compelled a declaration from the Church. But yet this ascent to the Heaven of Heavens would seem

[u] Vincent of Beauvais. See the curious volume of Mr. Wright, St. Patrick's Purgatory, on Tundale, p. 32, &c. On Patrick's Purgatory in all its forms, as sanctioned by Popes, and by the Bollandist writers, as it appears in Calderon's poetry, and as it is kept up by Irish popular superstition and priestcraft, Mr. Wright has collected many wild details.

from Dante, the best interpreter of the dominant conceptions, to have been an especial privilege, if it may be so said, of the most Blessed of the Blessed, the Saint of Saints. There is a manifest gradation in Beatitude and Sanctity. According to the universal cosmical theory, the Earth, the round and level earth, was the centre of the whole system.[x] It was usually supposed to be encircled by the vast, circumambient, endless ocean; but beyond that ocean (with a dim reminiscence, it should seem, of the Elysian Fields of the poets) was placed a Paradise, where the souls of men hereafter to be blest, awaited the final resurrection. Dante takes the other theory: he peoples the nine material heavens—that is, the cycle of the Moon, Venus, Mercury, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, the fixed stars, and the firmament above, or the Primum Mobile—with those who are admitted to a progressively advancing state of glory and blessedness. All this, it should seem, is below the ascending circles of the Celestial Hierarchies, that immediate vestibule or fore-court of the Holy of Holies, the Heaven of Heavens, into which the most perfect of the Saints are admitted. They are commingled with, yet unabsorbed by, the Redeemer, in mystic union; yet the mysticism still reverently endeavours to maintain some distinction in regard to this Light, which, as it has descended upon earth, is drawn up again to the highest Heavens, and has a kind

[x] The Eastern notions may be gathered from the curious Treatise of Cosmas Indicopleustes, printed by Montfaucon, in his Collectio Nova. Cosmas wrote about A.D. 535. He is perhaps the earliest type of those who call themselves Scriptural Philosophers; with all the positiveness and contemptuousness of ignorance, he proves that the heavens are a vault, from Isaiah xi. 22; from Job, according to the LXX., and St. Paul's image of a Tabernacle. The second Prologue is to refute the notion that the earth is a sphere,—the antipodes, which at first were not so disdainfully denied, are now termed *γραώδεις μύθοι*: men would fall in opposite directions. Paradise is beyond the circumfluent Ocean; souls are received in Paradise till the last day (p. 315). He afterwards asserts the absolute incompatibility of the spherical notion of the earth with the resurrection. He gives several opinions, all of which, in his opinion, are equally wrong. *Οἱ μὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς μόνας μετὰ θάνατον, περιτολεύειν σὺν τῇ σφαιρᾷ, καὶ ὁρᾶν ἤτοι γινώσκειν πάντα λέγουσιν· οἱ δὲ καὶ μετασωμάτωσιν βούλονται, καὶ προθιστὴν ἀσπάζουσι, οἷς καὶ ἕπεται λέγειν ἐξ ἀκολουθίας, καταλύεσθαι τὴν σφαῖραν.* The heavens are indissoluble, and all spiritualised bodies are to ascend to heaven. He gets rid of the strong passages about the heavens passing away, as metaphors (this in others he treated as absurd or impious). He denies the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles.

It is remarkable that what I presume to call the Angelology of this Treatise shows it to be earlier than the Pseudo-Dionysius; that work cannot have been known to Cosmas. One office of the Angels is to move—they are the perpetual movers of the Sun, Moon, and Stars.

of communion with the yet Incommunicable Deity. That in all the Paradise of Dante there should be a dazzling sameness, a mystic indistinctness, an inseparable blending of the real and the unreal, is not wonderful, if we consider the nature of the subject, and the still more incoherent and incongruous popular conceptions which he had to represent and to harmonise. It is more wonderful that, with these few elements, Light, Music, and Mysticism, he should, by his singular talent of embodying the purely abstract and metaphysical thought in the liveliest imagery, represent such things with the most objective truth, yet without disturbing their fine spiritualism. The subtlest scholasticism is not more subtle than Dante. It is perhaps a bold assertion, but what is there on these transcendent subjects, in the vast theology of Aquinas, of which the essence and sum is not in the Paradise of Dante? Dante, perhaps, though expressing to a great extent the popular conception of Heaven, is as much by his innate sublimity above it, as St. Thomas himself.[y]

After the Last day, the stars, sun, and moon being no more wanted, the Angels will be released from their duty, p. 154. The Angels carry the rain up from heaven into the clouds, so manage the stars as to cause Eclipses. These are guardian Angels. The Angels do not ascend above the stars, p. 315.

[y] Read the Anglo-Saxon description of Paradise, from the de Phœnice, ascribed to Lactantius, in the Exeter book by Thorpe, p. 197.

I am disposed to cite a description of Paradise according to its ordinary conception, almost the only possible conception—life without any of its evils—from a Poet older than Chaucer:—

There is lyf withoute ony deth,
And ther is youthe withoute ony elde,
And ther is alle manner welth to welde:
And ther is reste without ony travaille—
And ther is pees without ony strife,
And ther is alle mannere likynge of life—
And ther is bright somer ever to be:
And ther is nevere wynter in that cuntree:
And ther is more worshipe and honour,
Than ever hadde kynge other emperour.
And ther is greter melodee of aungeles songe,
And ther is preysing him amonge.
And ther is alle maner friendslhpe that may be,
And ther is evere perfect love and charitie;
And ther is wisdom without folye:
And ther is honeste without vilenage.
All these a man may joyes of Hevene call,
Ac yatte the most sovereign joye of alle
Is the sight of Goddes bright face,
In whom resteth alle mánere grace.

Richard of Hampole, quoted from MSS. by Turner. Hist. of England, v. 233.

CHAPTER III.

LATIN LETTERS.

LATIN CHRISTIANITY might seem to prolong, to perpetuate, the reign of Latin letters over the mind of man. Without Christianity, the language of Cicero, of Virgil, and of Tacitus, might have expired with the empire of Julius, of Augustus, and of Trajan. At the German invasion it must have broken up into barbarous and shifting dialects, as the world into barbarous and conflicting kingdoms. But as the language of religion, it continued to be the language of letters, for letters were almost entirely confined to those who alone could write books or read books, religious men. Through the clergy, the secretaries as it were of mankind, it was still the language of business, of law, of public affairs, of international treaties and private compacts, because it was the only common language, and because the ecclesiastics, the masters of that language, were from this and from causes already traced, the ministers of kings, the compilers of codes of law, mostly the notaries of all more important transactions. It only broke down gradually; it never, though defaced by barbarisms and foreign terms and forms of speech, by changing grammar and by the introduction of new words, fell into desuetude. It even just before its abrogation revived in something approaching to purity, and resumed within its own, and that no narrow sphere, its old established authority. The period at which Latin ceased to be the spoken language, in which the preacher addressed his flock, the magistrate the commonalty, the demagogue the populace, was of course different in different countries, especially in the Romance and Teutonic divisions of mankind. This may hereafter be the subject of very difficult, obscure, it must be feared, unsatisfactory inquiry.

Latin letters.

Maintained by Christianity.

But if Latin was the language of public affairs, it was

even more exclusively so that of letters. Not only all theologians, for a time all poets (at least those whose poetry was written), still longer all historians, to the end all philosophers, wrote in Latin. Christian literature however arose, not only when Latin letters had passed their meridian, but after their short day of glory and strength had sunk into exhaustion. The universal empire of Rome had been fatal to her letters. Few, indeed, of her best early writers had been Roman by birth; but they were Italians, and submitted to the spell of Roman ascendancy. Even under the Emperors Gaul and Spain began to furnish Latin poets and writers: for a short time Rome subdued them to the rules of her own grammar and the purer usages of her speech. But in the next century Latin letters, excepting only among the great jurisprudents, seem almost to have given place to Greek. They awoke again profoundly corrupt; the barbarising Augustan historians sink into the barbarous Ammianus Marcellinus. Africa becomes a prolific but dissonant school of heathen and of Christian writers; from some of the Panegyrists, who were Gallic rhetoricians, low enough in style, the fall is rapid and extreme to Hilary of Poitiers. Yet even in this respect Latin owes its vitality, and almost its Latinity, to Christian writers. Augustine and Jerome, though their language is very different from that of Livy or of Cicero, have a kind of dexterous management, a vigorous mastery, and a copiousness of language, unrivalled in their days. Sulpicius Severus surpasses in style any later historical work; Salvian is better than the Panegyrists. The Octavius of Minucius Felix has more of the older grace and correctness than any treatise of the day. Heathenism, or Indifferentism, strangely enough kept up the Pagan supremacy in poetry alone; Claudian, and even the few lines of Merobaudes, stand higher in purity, as in the life, of poetry, than all the Christian hexametrists.

Latin letters, therefore, having become the absolute exclusive property of the clergy, theology, of course, took the first place, and almost absorbed into itself every other branch of literature. Oratory was that of the pulpit, philosophy was divinity in another form. Even poetry taught

theology, or at its highest celebrated the holy exploits of hermits or monks, of saints and martyrs; and so it was through centuries, theology once having assumed, held its unshaken supremacy over letters.

But at the time of Nicolas V. became manifest the great revolution within Latin Christianity itself, which was eventually to be fatal, at least to her universal dominion. The great system of scholastic theology, the last development of that exclusive Hierarchical science, which had swallowed up all other sciences, of which philosophy was but a subject province, and dialectics an humble instrument, found itself, instead of the highest knowledge and the sole consummate dictatorial learning of the world, no more than the retired and self-exiled study of a still decreasing few, the professional occupation of a small section of the reading and inquiring world. Its empire had visibly passed away—its authority was shaken. In its origin, in its objects, in its style, in its immeasurable dimensions, in its scholasticism in short, this all-ruling Theology had been monastic; it had grown up in cloisters and in schools. There, men of few wants, and those wants supplied by rich endowments, in the dignity which belonged to the acknowledged leading intellects of the age, could devote to such avocations their whole undisturbed, undivided lives—lives, at least, in which nothing interfered with the quiet, monotonous, undistracting religious services. But Theology, before it would give up its tenacious hold on letters, must become secular; it must emancipate itself from scholasticism, from monasticism. It was not till after that first revolution that the emancipation of letters from theology was to come. Scholasticism.

Our history, before it closes, must survey the immense, and, notwithstanding its infinite variety and complexity of detail, the harmonious edifice of Latin theology.[a] We

[a] That survey must of necessity be rapid, and, as rapid, imperfect; nor can I boast any extensive or profound acquaintance with these ponderous tomes. The two best guides which I have been able to find (both have read, studied, profited by their laborious predecessors) are Ritter, in the volumes of his Christliche Philosophie, which embrace this part of his history; and an excellent Treatise by M. Haureau, de la Philosophie Scolastique. Mémoire Couronné par l'Académie, 2 tomes, Paris, 1850.

In England we have no guide. Dr. Hampden, who, from his article in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, on Thomas

must behold its strife, at times successful, always obstinate, with philosophy—its active and skilful employment of the weapons of philosophy, of dialectics, against their master—its constant effort to be at once philosophy and theology; the irruption of Aristotelism and of the Arabic philosophy, of which the Church did not at first apprehend all the perilous results, and in her pride supposed that it might bind to her own service; the culmination of the whole system in the five great schoolmen, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham. All this scholasticism was purely Latin—no Teutonic element entered into the controversies of the philosophising theologians. In England, in Germany, the schools and the monasteries, were Latin; the disputants spoke no other tongue. The theology which aspired to be philosophy would not condescend, could not indeed as yet have found expression in the undeveloped vulgar languages.[b]

Our history has already touched on the remoter ancestors of the Scholastic theology, on the solitary Scotus Erigena, who stands as a lonely beacon in his dark and turbulent times, and left none, or but remote, followers. The philosophy of Erigena was what the empire of Charlemagne had been, a vast organisation, out of the wreck of which rose later schools. He was by anticipation or tradition (from him Berengar, as has been shown, drew his rationalising Eucharistic system), by his genius, by his Greek or Oriental acquirements, by his translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius, a Platonist, or more than a Platonist; at length by his own fearless fathoming onwards into unknown depths, a Pantheist. We have dwelt on Anselm, in our judgement the real parent of mediæval theology—of that theology, which at the same time that it lets loose the reason, reins it in with a strong hand; on the intellectual insurrection, too, under Abélard, and its suppression. Anselm's lofty enterprise, the reconciliation of divinity and philosophy, had

Aquinas, promised to be the English historian of this remarkable chapter in the history of the human mind, has sunk into a quiet Bishop.

[b] Die Philosophie des Mittelalters gehört nicht der Zeiten an wo das Deutsche Element die Herrschaft hatte, sie ist vorherschend Romanische Natur.—Ritter, p. 37.

been premature; it had ended in failure.[c] Abélard had been compelled to submit his rebellious philosophy at the feet of authority. His fate for a time, to outward appearance at least, crushed the bold truths which lay hid in his system. Throughout the subsequent period theology and philosophy are contesting occasionally the bounds of their separate domains—bounds which it was impossible to mark with vigour and precision. Metaphysics soared into the realm of Theology; Theology when it came to Ontology, to reason on the being of God, could not but be metaphysical. At the same time, or only a few years later than Abélard, a writer, by some placed on a level, or even raised to superiority, as a philosophical thinker over Abélard, Gilbert de la Porée, through the abstruseness, perhaps obscurity of his teaching, the dignity of his position as Bishop, and his blameless character, was enabled to tread this border ground, if not without censure, without persecution.

But below that transcendental region, in which the mind treated of Being in the abstract, of the primary elements of thought, of the very first conception of God, Theology, in her proper sphere, would not endure the presence of her dangerous rival. Theology, rightly so called, professed to be primarily grounded on the Scriptures, but on the Scriptures interpreted, commented on, supplemented by a succession of writers (the Fathers), by decrees of Councils, and what was called the authority of the Church. The ecclesiastical law had now taken the abbreviated form of a code, rather a manual, under Ivo of Chartres. So Theology was to be cast into short authoritative sentences, which might be at once the subject and the rule of controversy, the war-law of the schools. If Philosophy presumed to lay its profane hands on these subjects, it was warned off as trespassing on the manor of the Church. Logic might lend its humble ministrations to prove in syllogistic form those canonised truths; if it proceeded further, it became a perilous and proscribed weapon.

Peter the Lombard was, as it were, the Euclid of this science. His sentences were to be the irrefragable axioms

[c] L'entreprise de S. Anselme avait échoué; personne n'avait pu concilier la philosophie et la théologie.—Haureau, i. p. 318.

and definitions from which were to be deduced all the higher and more remote truths of divinity; on them the great theological mathematicians built what appeared their infallible demonstrations.

Peter the Lombard.

Peter the Lombard was born near Novara, the native place of Lanfranc and of Anselm. He was Bishop of Paris in 1159. His famous book of the Sentences was intended to be, and became to a great extent, the Manual of the Schools. Peter knew not, or disdainfully threw aside, the philosophical cultivation of his day. He adhered rigidly to all which passed for Scripture, and was the authorised interpretation of the Scripture, to all which had become the creed in the traditions, law in the decretals, of the Church. He seems to have no apprehension of doubt in his stern dogmatism; he will not recognise any of the difficulties suggested by philosophy; he cannot, or will not, perceive the weak points of his own system. He has the great merit that, opposed as he was to the prevailing Platonism, throughout the Sentences the ethical principle predominates; his excellence is perspicuity, simplicity, definiteness of moral purpose. His distinctions are endless, subtle, idle; but he wrote from conflicting authorities to reconcile writers at war with each other, at war with themselves. Their quarrels had been wrought to intentional or unintentional antagonism in "the Sic et Non" of Abélard. That philosopher, whether Pyrrhonist or more than Pyrrhonist, had left them in all the confusion of strife; he had set Fathers against Fathers, each Father against himself, the Church against the Church, tradition against tradition, law against law. The Lombard announced himself and was accepted as the mediator, the final arbiter in this endless litigation; he would sternly fix the positive, proscribe the negative or sceptical view, in all these questions. The litigation might still go on, but within the limits which he had rigidly established; he had determined those ultimate results against which there was no appeal. The mode of proof might be interminably contested in the schools; the conclusion was already irrefragably fixed. On the sacramental system Peter the Lombard is loftily, severely hierarchical. Yet he is moderate in the power of the keys: he holds only a declaratory power of binding and

loosing — of showing how the souls of men were to be bound and loosed.[d]

From the hard and arid system of Peter the Lombard the profound devotion of the Middle Ages took refuge in Mysticism. But it is an error to suppose Mysticism as the perpetual antagonist of Scholasticism; the Mystics were often severe Logicians; the Scholastics had all the passion of Mystics. Nor were the Scholastics always Aristotelians and Nominalists, or the Mystics, Realists and Platonists. The logic was often that of Aristotle, the philosophy that of Plato. Hugo and Richard de St. Victor (the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris) were the great Mystics of this period. The mysticism of Hugo de St. Victor withdrew the contemplator altogether from the outward to the inner world—from God in the works of nature to God in his workings on the soul of man. This contemplation of God, the consummate perfection of man, is immediate, not mediate. Through the Angels and the Celestial Hierarchy of the Areopagite it aspires to one God, not in his Theophany, but in his inmost essence. All ideas and forms of things are latent in the human soul, as in God, only they are manifested to the soul by its own activity, its meditative power. Yet St. Victor is not exempt from the grosser phraseology of the Mystics—the tasting God, and other degrading images from the senses of men. The ethical system of Hugo de St. Victor is that of the Church, more free and lofty than the dry and barren discipline of Peter Lombard;[e] it looks to the end and object, not merely to the punctilious performance of Church works. Richard de St. Victor was at once more logical and more devout, raising higher at once the unassisted power of man, yet with even more supernatural interference—less ecclesiastical, more religious.[f] Thus the

Hugo de St. Victor.

Richard de St. Victor.

[d] Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit, quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi et ligandi, *i.e.* ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos, quoted by Ritter, p. 499. Ritter's account of the Lombard appears to me, as compared with the Book of Sentences, so just and sagacious, that I have adopted implicitly his conclusions, to a certain extent his words.

[e] Contemplatio est illa vivacitas intelligentiæ, quæ cuncta palam Patris manifestâ visione comprehendit.—M. In Eccles. i. p. 55, quoted by Ritter, p. 538.

[f] Ritter has drawn the distinction between these two writers with great skill and nicety.

silent, solemn cloister was as it were constantly balancing the noisy and pugnacious school. The system of the St. Victors is the contemplative philosophy of deep-thinking minds in their profound seclusion, not of intellectual gladiators: it is that of men following out the train of their own thoughts, not perpetually crossed by the objections of subtle rival disputants. Its end is not victory, but the inward satisfaction of the soul. It is not so much conscious of ecclesiastical restraint, it is rather self-restrained by its inborn reverence; it has no doubt, therefore no fear; it is bold from the inward consciousness of its orthodoxy.

John of Salisbury. John of Salisbury, though he professed to be of the school of the St. Victors, had something of the practical English character. He was far less of a Monk, more of an observant man of the world. The Mystic was lost in the high churchman. He was the right hand and counsellor of Becket, though, like Becket, he says hard things of the Pope and of Rome; he was the inflexible asserter of the rights of the Church. John has the fullest faith in the theological articles of the Church, with some academic scepticism on the philosophic questions. John was neither of the cloister nor of the school: he has something of the statesman, even something of the natural philosopher.

Scholastic philosophy has no great name during the last quarter of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century. But during this barren and mute period came gradually and silently stealing in, from an unobserved unsuspected quarter, new views of knowledge, new metaphysical modes of thought, which went up into the primal principles of theology; dialectic processes, if not new, more perfect. Greek books, as yet unknown, are now in the hands of the studious; works of Aristotle, either entirely lost for centuries, or imperfectly known in the abstracts of Augustine, of Boethius, and Martianus Capella. It was from the Arabic language, from the godless and accursed Mohammedans, that Christendom received these inauspicious gifts.

This Mohammedan, or Græco-Mohammedan philosophy, was as far removed from the old stern inflexible Uni-

tarianism of the Korân as the Korân from the Gospel. Philosophy was in truth more implacably oppugnant, a more flagrant heresy to Islam than to mediæval Christianity. Islam, like Christianity, the Latin hierarchical Christianity, had its Motakhelim, its high churchmen; its Sufis, its mystic monks; its Maatizali, its heretics or dissidents; its philosophers, properly so called, its Aristotelians. But the philosophic schools of Islam were as much or more foreign to the general Mohammedan mind than the scholastic oligarchy of Christendom to that of Western Europe. In the general estimation they were half or more than half heretical, the intellectual luxuries of splendid Courts and Caliphs, who were, at least, no longer rigid Islamists.[g] It was not, as in Europe, the philosophy of a great hierarchy.

Arabic Philosophy.

Of all curious chapters in the history of the human mind, none is more singular than the growth, progress, and influence of the Arabo-Aristotelian philosophy.[h] Even in the second century after the Hegira, more fully in the third, this science found its way among the Mohammedans of Syria. After having made its circuit, five or six centuries after it came out again in Spain, and from the schools of Cordova entered into the Universities of France and Italy. In both cases it was under the same escort, that of medicine, that it subjugated in turn Islam and Christianity. Physicians were its teachers in Damascus and Bagdad, in Paris and Auxerre.

The Arabians in their own country, in their free wild life, breathing the desert air, ever on horseback, had few diseases or only diseases peculiar to their habits. With the luxuries, the repose, the indolence, the residence in great cities, the richer diet of civilisation, they could not avoid the maladies of civilisation. They were obliged to call in native science to their aid. As in their buildings, their coinage, and most handicraft works, they employed Greek

[g] Mahomet is made to prophesy in as stern language as the fiercest Catholic. Mon église sera divisée en plus de soixante-dix sectes: il n'y a qu'une qui sera sauvée, les autres iront à l'enfer; or ce qu'il a prédit, est arrivé.—Schmolders, p. 89.

[h] On ne pourra parler d'une philosophie Arabe dans le sens strict du mot. . . . . On n'entend dire autre chose que la Philosophie Grecque, telle que les Arabes la cultivaient.—Schmolders, Essai sur les Ecoles Philosophiques des Arabes. p. 41.

Again,

"Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit."

or Syrian art, so medicine was introduced and cultivated among them by Syrians, Greeks, and Jews. They received those useful strangers not only with tolerant respect, but with high and grateful honour. The strangers brought with them not only their medical treatises, the works of Hippocrates and Galen, and besides these the Alexandrian astronomy, which developed itself in the general Asiatic mind into astrology;[l] but at length also and by degrees the whole Greek philosophy, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria and the Aristotelian dialectics of Greece. The asserters of the one Book, the destroyers as they are said to have been of all books but that one, became authors so prolific, not in poetry alone, their old pride and delight, but in the infinite variety and enormous mass of their philosophic treatises, as to equal if not surpass the vast and almost incalculable volumes of Scholastic divinity.[k]

As in Syria of old, so now in France and other parts of Christendom, Philosophy stole in under the protection of medicine. It was as physicians that the famous Arabian philosophers, as well as some Jews, acquired unsuspected fame and authority. There is not a philosopher who has not some connection with medicine, nor a physician who had not some connection with philosophy. The translators of the most famous philosophers, of Averrhoes and Avicenna, were physicians; metaphysics only followed in the train of physical science.[m]

The Græco-Arabic philosophy worked into the system of the schools in two different modes:—I. The introduction of works of Aristotle, either unknown or now communicated in a more perfect form. II. The Arabic philosophy, which had now grown to its height under the Abbasside

[l] Diese Ansicht der Dinge welche das Geschehen auf der Erde mit den Bewegungen des Himmels in einen physischen Zusammenhang bringt, ist ein characteristiches Zug welche durch alle Lehre der Arabischen Aristotelischer hindurch geht. Wenn auch schon vor ihnen Astrologische Lehren auf der Philosophie einen Influss geübt hatten, so bildeten doch sie zuerst die Astrologie zu einem philosophischen Systeme aus.—Ritter, viii. p. 161. The Astrology of the Middle Ages no doubt owes much to and is a sign of the prevalence of the Arabic philosophy.

[k] La masse des prétendus Philosophes est si grande, leurs ouvrages sont numériquement si prodigieux, que toute la Scolastique est bien pauvre en comparaison des Arabes.—Schmolders. Has this learned author calculated or *weighed* the volumes of the Schoolmen?

[m] Ritter, p. 676.

Caliphs in the East, Almanzor, Haroun al Raschid, Motakem,[n] and under the Ommiades in Spain. The Eastern school, after Alghazil and Fakhreddin Rhazis, had culminated in Avicenna, the Western in Averrhoes. Schools had arisen in Cordova, Seville, Toledo, Grenada, Xativa, Valencia, Murcia, Almeria. Averrhoes had an endless race of successors.

Aristotelian Philosophy.

Profound, it might seem almost impenetrable darkness, covered the slow, silent interpenetration of both these influences into the Christian schools. How, through what channels, did Aristotle rise to his ascendancy? to what extent were the Schoolmen acquainted with the works of the Arabian philosophers? The first at least of these questions has found a satisfactory solution.[o] During all the earlier period, from Anselm and Abélard to the time of Albert the Great, from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, the name of Aristotle was great and authoritative in the West, but it was only as the teacher of logic, as the master of Dialectics. Even this logic, which may be traced in the darkest times, was chiefly known in a secondary form, through Augustine, Boethius[p] and the Isagoge of Porphyry; at the utmost, the Treatises which form the Organon, and not the whole of these, were known in the Church. It was as dangerously proficient in the Aristotelian logic, as daring to submit theology to the rules of Dialectics, that Abélard excited the jealous apprehensions of St. Bernard.[q] Throughout the intermediate period, to Gilbert de la Porée, to the St. Victors, to John of Salisbury,

[n] The Nestorian Churches in Persia and Khorasân were instrumental to the progress of philosophising Islamism.

[o] This question has been, if I may so say, judicially determined by M. Jourdain, Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote, new edition, revised by his son, Paris, 1843. These are the general conclusions of M. Jourdain: I. That the only works of Aristotle known in the West until the twelfth century were the Treatises on Logic, which compose the Organon. (The Analytics, Topics, and Sophistic Refutations are more rarely cited.) II. That from the date of the following century, the other parts of his philosophy were translated into Latin. III. That of those Translations some were from a Greek, some from an Arabic text. M. Jourdain fairly examines and states the names of former writers on the subject,—Brucker, Tiedemann, Buhle, Tenneman, Heeren.

[p] On the books translated by Boethius and the earlier Translations, Jourdain, pp. 30, 52, &c.

[q] See vol. iii. B. viii. c. 5. Compare Jourdain, p. 24. Abélard confesses his ignorance of the Physics and Metaphysics. Quæ quidem opera ipsius nullus adhuc translata linguæ Latinæ aptavit; ideoque minus natura eorum nobis est cognita.—Abelard. Oper. Ined. p. 200.

to Alain de Lille, to Adelard of Bath, Aristotle was the logician and no more.[r] Of his Morals, his Metaphysics, his Physics, his Natural History, there is no knowledge whatever. His fame as a great, universal philosopher hardly lived, or lived only in obscure and doubtful tradition.

On a sudden, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, there is a cry of terror from the Church, in the centre of the most profound theological learning of the Church, the University of Paris, and the cry is the irrefragable witness to the influence of what was vaguely denounced as the philosophy of Aristotle. It is not now presumptuous Dialectics, which would submit theological truth to logical system, but philosophical theories, directly opposed to the doctrines of the Church; the clamour is loud against certain fatal books[s] but newly brought into the schools.[t] Simon of Tournay,[u] accused of utter infidelity, may have employed the perilous weapons of Dialectics to perplex his hearers and confute his adversaries; but he was also arraigned as having been led into his presumptuous tenets by the study of the Physics and Metaphysics of Aristotle. The heresies of Amaury de Bene, and of David of Dinant, were traced by the theologians of Paris to the same fertile source of evil. An exhumation of the remains of Amaury de Bene, who, though suspected, had been buried in consecrated ground, was followed by a condemnation of his followers, the teachers of these dreaded opinions. Some were degraded and made over to the secular arm (to the State), some to

[r] The name of Aristotle is not to be found in Peter the Lombard.—Jourdain, 29.

[s] These books are said by the continuator of Rigord, William the Breton, to have contained the Metaphysics of Aristotle; and in two other writers of the period, in Cæsar of Heisterbach, and Hugh the Continuator of the Chronicle of Auxerre, to have been the Physics. The Decree for burning the books (see below) determines the point.

[t] Crevier, t. i. p. 338, or rather Du Boulay, asserted that these books had been brought from Constantinople about 1167, and translated into Latin. M. Jourdain, Note, p. 46, has shown the inaccuracy of this statement.

[u] Simon of Tournay delivered with wonderful applause a Lecture, in which he explained or proved all the great Mysteries of religion by the Aristotelic process. "Stay," he closed his Lecture; "to-morrow I will utterly confute all that I have proved to-day by stronger arguments." He was struck on that morrow with apoplexy, and lost his speech.—Crevier, i. p. 309. It should seem that Simon de Tournay was rather an expert dialectician than an inquiring philosopher.

perpetual imprisonment. There was a solemn prohibition against the reading and copying of these books; all the books which could be seized were burned.[x] Six years after, Robert de Courçon, the Papal Legate, interdicted the reading of the Physics and Metaphysics of Aristotle in the schools of Paris.[y] A milder decree of Gregory IX. ordered that they should not be used till they had been corrected by the theologians of the Church; yet two years before this Gregory had fulminated a violent Bull against the presumption of those who taught the Christian doctrine rather according to the rules of Aristotle than the traditions of the Fathers,[z] against the profane usage of mingling up philosophy with Divine revelation. But the secret of all this terror and perplexity of the Church was not that the pure and more rational philosophy of Aristotle was revealed in the schools; the evil and the danger more clearly denounced were in the Arabian Comment, which, inseparable from the Arabo-Latin translation, had formed a system fruitful of abuse and error.[a]

The heresy of Amaury de Bene, and that of David de Dinant, was Pantheism.[b] The Creator and the Creation were but one; all flowed from God, all was to be reabsorbed in God—a doctrine not less irreconcileable with genuine Aristotelism than with the doctrine of the Church.[c] But the greater Schoolmen of the next period aspired, with what success it may be doubted, to the nobler triumph of

[x] All kinds of incongruous charges were heaped on the memory of Amaury de Bene: he was an Albigensian, believed in the Eternal Gospel.

[y] See the Decree of the Archbishop of Sens and the Council, unknown to Launoi and earlier authors, Martene, Nov. Thes. Anec. iv. 166. Corpus Magistri Amaurici extrahatur a cemeterio et projiciatur in terram non benedictam et idem excommunicetur per omnes ecclesias totius provinciæ. A list of names follows, isti degradentur, penitus sæculari curiæ reliquendi; another list, perpetuo carceri mancipandi. The Books of David de Dinant are to be burned, nec libri Aristotelis de *Naturali* Philosophia, nec *Commenta* legantur Parisiis publice vel secreto.

[z] Non legantur libri Aristotelis de Metaphysicâ et Naturali Philosophiâ, nec summa de eisdem, aut de doctrinâ Mag. David de Dinant, aut Almerici heretici, aut Mauritii Hispan. — Stat. Univ. Par.

[a] On voit dans ces trois condamnations une diminution successive de sévérité. La première est la plus rigoureuse, les autres s'en vont s'adoucissant. Crevier blames this mildness, p. 312.

[b] Roger Bacon nous apprend que l'on s'opposa long temps à Paris à la philosophie naturelle et à la métaphysique d'Aristote *exposées par Avicenne et Averroés;* ceux qui s'en servaient furent excommuniés.—P. 194. See the following quotation from Roger Bacon, and the whole passage.

[c] See the sources of their doctrines, Jourdain, p. 196.

subjugating Aristotelism to the science of Theology, not the logical science only, but the whole range of the Stagirite's philosophy.[d] It was to be an obsequious and humble, though honoured ally, not a daring rival; they would set free, yet at the same time bind its stubborn spirit in their firm grasp, to more than amity, to perfect harmony.

Albert the Great, in his unbounded range of knowledge, comprehends the whole metaphysical, moral, physical, as well as logical system of Aristotle.[e] He had read all, or, with but few unimportant exceptions, his whole works. He had read them in Latin, some translated directly from the Greek, some from the Arabic; some few had been translated from the Arabic into Hebrew, and from the Hebrew into the Latin. Those which came through the Arabic retain distinct and undeniable marks of their transmission—Arabic words, especially words untranslated, Arabic idioms, and undeniable vestiges of the Arabic vowel system.[f] These versions from the Arabic came: I. From Spain and from Spanish scholars in the South of France, at Marseilles, Montpellier, Toulouse. II. From Sicily, where Frederic II. had fostered Arabic learning, and had encouraged translations from that tongue. Under his auspices the famous Michael Scott had translated, at least, the books of Natural History.[g] Besides these some had come through the Hebrew; the great age of Jewish philosophy, that of Aben-Esra, Maimonides, and Kimchi, had been contemporaneous with the later Spanish school of Arabic philosophy. There had been an intercommunion or rivalry in the cultivation of the whole range of philosophy. The translations from the Greek were as yet few, imperfect, inaccurate.[h] The greater Thomas Aquinas has

[d] See in Jourdain the works cited by William Bishop of Paris, who died 1248. —P. 31.

[e] Works quoted by Albert the Great also, p. 32.

[f] Jamais une version dérivée d'un texte Arabe ne présenta, fidèlement orthographié, un mot qui aura passé par l'intermédiaire de l'Arabe, langue où la prononciation n'est réglée que par les points diacritiques qui sont rarement bien placés. Souvent aussi les traducteurs ne connaissant pas la valeur d'un terme l'ont laissé en Arabe.—Jourdain, p. 19. See the whole passage, and also p. 37.

[g] On the translation by M. Scott, from the Arabic, not through the Hebrew, Jourdain, p. 124, *et seqq.*, and Herman Alemannus, with whom the older Herman Contractus (the Lame) has been confounded.—Jourdain, p. 93.

[h] Among the earliest Translations from the Greek was the Nicomachean

the merit of having encouraged and obtained a complete translation of the works of Aristotle directly from the Greek.[i] The cultivation of Greek had never entirely ceased in the West. After Scotus Erigena and Adélard of Bath travelled in the East, these casual and interrupted communications grew into more regular and constant intercourse. But now the Latin conquest of Constantinople had made Eastern and Western Christendom one. If the conquering army, the sovereign and the territorial lords, did not condescend to acquire much of the language of their subjects, the conquering Church was more wise and enterprising. Innocent III. proposed to the University of Paris to send a colony of scholars to learn the tongue of the people, among whom the Latin clergy was to administer the rites of the Church;[k] a school for youths from Constantinople was to be opened at Paris.[m] No doubt many Byzantine exiles, men of peace and learning, found their way to the West. The Mendicant Orders, spreading over the world, made it their duty and their boast to acquire foreign tongues; and now especially the Dominicans aspired to the highest places in learning and knowledge. Thus the complete and genuine Aristotle was divulged. Towards the end of the thirteenth century the philosophers of Greece and Rome were as well known, as in our own days; the schools rung with their names,[n] with the explanation of their writings. A scholastic Doctor was not thought worthy of his name who had not publicly commented on their writings.[o] It was not alone as a servile translator of the Greek, as the inert and uninventive disciple of the Western philosophy, which it was to restore to its forgotten honours in the West, Arabian Philosophy.

Ethics, by no less a man than Robert Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln. M. Jourdain satisfactorily proves this remarkable fact.—P. 59, *et seqq.*

[i] Scripsit etiam super philosophiam naturalem et moralem et super metaphysicam, quorum librorum procuravit ut fieret nova translatio quæ sententiæ Aristotelis contineret clarius veritatem.—Tocco. Vit. C. Th. Aquin. Act. SS. March. On sait que ce fut par les conseils et les soins de S. Thomas d'Aquin que fut faite une traduction Latine d'Aristote.—Tenneman. Manuel, French Translation.

[k] Epistolæ Innocent III. Brequigny et Du Thul. ii. 712, 723.

[m] Bulæus, iii. iv.

[n] The earlier Western students, who travelled before the twelfth century, Constantine the Monk, the famous Gerbert, Adelard of Bath, sought rather mathematical or astronomical science.

[o] Jourdain, p. 2.

that Arabian Philosophy aspired, if not to rule, to influence the mind of Christendom.[p] The four great Arabic authors, Avicenna, Aven Pace, Avicembron, Averrhoes, with David the Jew, and others of less fame,[q] introduced, chiefly perhaps through the Jews of Andalusia, Marseilles, and Montpellier (those Dragomen of Mediæval Science), are not only known to the later Schoolmen; but even the suspicion, the jealousy, the awe, has fallen away. They are treated with courtesy and respect, allowed fair hearing; that which at the beginning of the century appeared so perilous, so formidable, is no longer the forbidden lore of heretics, of unbelievers, of atheists. The Arabians are entertained as grave philosophers; their theories are examined, their arguments discussed. Their authority, as representatives of a lofty and commanding philosophy, which has a right to respectful attention, is fully acknowledged.[r]

Avicenna and Averrhoes are placed by Dante among the philosophers who wanted only baptism to be saved; and Dante no doubt learned his respect for their names from his master, S. Thomas.[s]

The extent to which Latin Christianity, in its highest scholasticism, admitted, either avowedly or tacitly, consciously or imperceptibly, the influence of the philosophy of Bagdad or Cordova, how far reached this fusion of refined Islamism and Christianity, our History wants space, the Historian knowledge of the yet unfathomed depths of Arabian learning, to determine.[t]

[p] See Jourdain on the Translations from the Arabic, by Dominic and John the Jew, in the twelfth century.

[q] Ajoutons que les philosophes Arabes, Avicenne, Averroes, Aven Pace, etc., oubliés maintenant, jouissaient alors d'une grande réputation.—*Ibid.*

[r] M. Schmolders is of opinion that the Schoolmen were much more indebted to the Græco-Arabic philosophy than is generally supposed. L'influence exercée par eux sur le Scholastique est beaucoup plus grande qu'on ne la suppose ordinairement. Non seulement les Scholastiques semblent en convenir eux-mêmes à cause de leurs nombreuses citations, mais il n'est pas difficile de prouver qu'ils sont redevables aux Arabes d'une foule d'idées qu'on leur a jusqu'à présent attribuées.—P. 104.

[s] Inferno, iv. This shows at once their fame, and that Arabic philosophers were not popularly rejected as impious and godless.

[t] I almost presume, as far as my own reading extends, to doubt whether there are sufficient grounds as yet for deciding this question. It requires a profound knowledge of Oriental and of Mediæval lore in one person. M. Schmolders possesses the first, M. Ritter perhaps a large proportion of both. M. Haureau, the great Master of Scholasticism, rather declines, at least does not fully enter into the discussion.

Now came the great age of the Schoolmen. Latin Christianity raised up those vast monuments of Theology which amaze and appal the mind with the enormous accumulation of intellectual industry, ingenuity, and toil;[u] but of which the sole result to posterity is this barren amazement. The tomes of Scholastic Divinity may be compared with the pyramids of Egypt, which stand in that rude majesty, which is commanding from the display of immense human power, yet oppressive from the sense of the waste of that power for no discoverable use. Whoever penetrates within, finds himself bewildered and lost in a labyrinth of small, dark, intricate passages and chambers, devoid of grandeur, devoid of solemnity: he may wander without end, and find nothing! It was not indeed the enforced labour of a slave population: it was rather voluntary slavery, submitting in its intellectual ambition and its religious patience to monastic discipline: it was the work of a small intellectual oligarchy, monks, of necessity, in mind and habits; for it imperiously required absolute seclusion either in the monastery or in the University, a long life under monastic rule. No Schoolman could be a great man but as a Schoolman. William of Ockham alone was a powerful demagogue—scholastic even in his political writings, but still a demagogue. It is singular to see every kingdom in Latin Christendom, every Order in the social State, furnishing the great men, not merely to the successive lines of Doctors, who assumed the splendid titles of the Angelical, the Seraphic, the Irrefragable, the most Profound, the most Subtle, the Invincible, even the Perspicuous,[x] but even to what may be called the supreme Pentarchy of Scholasticism. Italy sent Thomas of Aquino and Bonaventura; Germany Albert the Great; the British Isles (they boasted also of

Great æra of Scholasticism.

Five Great Schoolmen.

[u] The study of Arabic, which had been fostered by Frederick II., carried to high perfection by Michael Scott and others, was not discouraged in the Universities. Honorius IV. proposed an endowment for this study in the University of Paris. The ostensible object was the education of Missionaries to propagate the Gospel among the Islamites. The foundation did not take place till the Council of Vienne.—Crevier, ii. 112. At an early period, perhaps, it might rather have promoted the invasion of Christianity by the Arabic philosophy.

[x] Aquinas, Bonaventura, Alexander Hales, Ægidius de Colonna, Ockham, Walter Burley.

Alexander Hales and Bradwardine) Duns Scotus and William of Ockham; France alone must content herself with names somewhat inferior (she had already given Abélard, Gilbert de la Porée, Amauri de Bene, and other famous or suspected names), now William of Auvergne, at a later time Durandus. Albert and Aquinas were of noble Houses, the Counts of Bollstadt and Aquino; Bonaventura of good parentage at Fidenza; of Scotus the birth was so obscure as to be untraceable; Ockham was of humble parents in the village of that name in Surrey. But France may boast that the University of Paris was the great scene of their studies, their labours, their instruction: the University of Paris was the acknowledged awarder of the fame and authority obtained by the highest Schoolmen. It is no less remarkable that the new Mendicant Orders sent forth these five Patriarchs, in dignity, of the science. Albert and Aquinas were Dominicans, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, Ockham, Franciscans. It might have been supposed that the popularising of religious teaching, which was the express and avowed object of the Friar Preachers and of the Minorites, would have left the higher places of abstruse and learned Theology to the older Orders, or to the more dignified Secular Ecclesiastics. Content with being the vigorous antagonists of heresy in all quarters, they would not aspire also to become the aristocracy of theologic erudition. But the dominant religious impulse of the times could not but seize on all the fervent and powerful minds which sought satisfaction for their devout yearnings. No one who had strong religious ambition could be anything but a Dominican or a Franciscan; to be less was to be below the highest standard. Hence on one hand the Orders aspired to rule the Universities, contested the supremacy with all the great established authorities in the schools; and having already drawn into their vortex almost all who united powerful abilities with a devotional temperament, never wanted men who could enter into this dreary but highly rewarding service,—men who could rule the Schools, as others of their brethren had begun to rule the Councils and the minds of Kings. It may be strange to contrast the popular simple preaching, for such must have

All Mendicants.

been that of S. Dominic and S. Francis, such that of their followers, in order to contend with success against the plain and austere Sermons of the heretics, with the Sum of Theology of Aquinas, which of itself (and it is but one volume in the works of Thomas) would, as it might seem, occupy a whole life of the most secluded study to write, almost to read. The unlearned, unreasoning, only profoundly, passionately loving and dreaming S. Francis, is still more oppugnant to the intensely subtle and dry Duns Scotus, at one time carried by his severe logic into Pelagianism; or to William of Ockham, perhaps the hardest and severest intellectualist of all; a political fanatic, not like his visionary brethren, who brooded over the Apocalypse and their own prophets, but for the Imperial against the Papal Sovereignty.

As then in these five men culminates the age of genuine Scholasticism, the rest may be left to be designated and described to posterity by the names assigned to them by their own wondering disciples.

We would change, according to our notion, the titles which discriminated this distinguished pentarchy. Albert the Great would be the Philosopher, Aquinas the Theologian, Bonaventura the Mystic, Duns Scotus the Dialectician, Ockham the Politician. It may be said of Scholasticism, as a whole, that whoever takes delight in what may be called gymnastic exercises of the reason or the reasoning powers, efforts which never had, and hardly cared to have, any bearing on the life, or even on the sentiments and opinions of mankind, may study these works, the crowning effort of Latin, of Sacerdotal, and Monastic Christianity, and may acquire something like respect for these forgotten athletes in the intellectual games of antiquity. They are not of so much moment in the history of religion, for their theology was long before rooted in the veneration and awe of Christendom; nor in that of philosophy, for except what may be called mythological subtleties, questions relating to the world of angels and spirits, of which, according to them, we might suppose the revelation to man as full and perfect, as that of God or of the Redeemer, there is hardly a question which has not

been examined in other language and in less dry and syllogistic form. There is no acute observation on the workings of the human mind, no bringing to bear extraordinary facts on the mental, or mingled mental and corporeal, constitution of our being. With all their researches into the unfathomable they have fathomed nothing: with all their vast logical apparatus they have proved nothing to the satisfaction of the inquisitive mind. Not only have they not solved any of the insoluble problems of our mental being, our primary conceptions, our relations to God, to the Infinite, neither have they (a more possible task) shown them to be insoluble.[y]

Albert the Great. A.D. 1193.

Albert the Great was born at Lauingen in Swabia, of the ancient house of the Counts of Bollstadt. He studied at Paris and in Padua. In Padua, Jordan the Saxon, the head of the Dominicans, laid on him the spell of his own master-mind and that of his Order; he became a Dominican. He returned to Cologne, and taught in the schools of that city. In 1228 he was called to fill the chair of his Order in the Jacobin convent at Paris. There, though his text-book was the rigid, stone-cold Sentences of Peter the Lombard, his bold originality, the confidence with which he rushed on ground yet untrodden, at once threw back all his competitors into obscurity, and seemed to summon reason, it might be to the aid, it might be as a perilous rival to religion. This, by his admirers, was held as hardly less than divine inspiration, but provoked his adversaries and his enemies. "God," it was said, "had never divulged so many of his secrets to one of his creatures." Others murmured, "He must be possessed by an evil spirit:" already the fame, the suspicion of a magician had begun to gather round his name. After three years of glory, perhaps of some danger, in Paris, he settled among his Dominican brethren at Cologne. At Cologne he was visited by the Emperor William of Holland, who bowed down in wonder before the extraordinary

1211.

[y] Il est donc bien difficile aux philosophes d'avouer que la philosophie consiste plutôt à reconnaître la limite naturelle de l'intelligence humaine qu'à faire de puérils efforts pour reculer cette limite. — Haureau, ii. p. 45, quoting Locke, whose whole, wise, but strangely misrepresented work is a comment on that great axiom.

man. As Provincial of Germany, commissioned by the Diet of Worms, he visited all the monasteries of his jurisdiction. He severely reproved the Monks, almost universally sunk in ignorance and idleness; he rescued many precious manuscripts which in their ignorance they had left buried in dust, or in their fanaticism cast aside as profane. He was summoned to Rome, and named Grand Master of the Palace—the great dignity usually held by his Order—by Pope Alexander IV. He laid down his dignity, and retired to his school at Cologne. He was compelled to accept the Bishopric of Ratisbon. After three years of able administration he resigned to Urban IV. the unwelcome greatness, and again retired to his seclusion, his studies, and public instruction at Cologne. Such was the public life, such the honours paid to the most illustrious of the Schoolmen.[z] 1260. 1263. Died in 1280.

Albert the Great at once awed by his immense erudition and appalled his age. His name, the Universal Doctor, was the homage to his all-embracing knowledge. He quotes, as equally familiar, Latin, Greek, Arabic, Jewish philosophers.[a] He was the first Schoolman who lectured on Aristotle himself, on Aristotle from Græco-Latin or Arabo-Latin copies. The whole range of the Stagirite's physical and metaphysical philosophy was within the scope of Albert's teaching.[b] In later days he was called the Ape of Aristotle; he had dared to introduce Aristotle into the Sanctuary itself.[c] One of his Treatises is a refu-

[z] Haureau, t. ii. p. 1, *et seqq.* I owe most of what follows, with references to the original works, to the two Chapters on Albert the Great in Ritter, Christliche Philosophie, viii. p. 181, and M. Haureau, De la Philosophie Scolastique, ii. p. 1. I think the German has an unusual advantage over the Frenchman in the order, and therefore in the perspicuity, with which he has developed the system of Albert the Great. In his sharp, precise language the Frenchman resumes his superiority; and it must be remembered that the object of M. Haureau's work is the Scholastic Philosophy. I have also read M. Rousselot, Etudes, and some of the older writers.

[a] Et in hanc sententiam convenerunt multi Theologi diversarum religionum tam scilicet Saracenorum, quam Judæorum, quam Christianorum. — Lib. viii. Physic. c. vi., quoted by M. Haureau, ii. p. 54. Alexander Hales (about 1222) had illustrated Christian Theology from Aristotle and Avicenna. — Ritter, 181. Also William of Auvergne. See Haureau, p. 11.

[b] The only Treatises which the Scholastic Philosopher might seem to disdain were the popular and practical ones, the Rhetoric, Poetics, and the Politics.—Ritter, p. 188.

[c] See quotation from Thomasius in Haureau, and M. Haureau's refutation. An andern Orten giebt er zu erkennen, er wollte hier nur die Meinung der Peripatiker wiedergeben; wie dieselbe mit der Katholischen Lehre ausgeglichen werden könne, lässt er dahin gestellt

tation of the Arabian Averrhoes. Nor is it Aristotle and Averrhoes alone that come within the pale of Albert's erudition; the commentators and glossators of Aristotle, the whole circle of the Arabians, are quoted, their opinions, their reasonings, even their words, with the utmost familiarity. But with Albert Theology was still the master-science. The Bishop of Ratisbon was of unimpeached orthodoxy; the vulgar only, in his wonderful knowledge of the secrets of Nature, in his studies of Natural History, could not but see something of the magician. Albert had the ambition of reconciling Plato and Aristotle, and of reconciling this harmonised Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy with Christian Divinity. He thus, in some degree, misrepresented or misconceived both the Greeks; he hardened Plato into Aristotelism, expanded Aristotelism into Platonism; and his Christianity, though Albert was a devout man, while it constantly subordinates, in strong and fervent language, knowledge to faith and love, became less a religion than a philosophy. Albert has little of, he might seem to soar above the peculiar and dominant doctrines of Christianity; he dwells on the nature of God rather than on the Trinity, on the immortality of the soul rather than the redemption; on sin, on original sin, he is almost silent. According to the established Christian theology, Creation and Redemption were simultaneously in the counsels of God. In the new system, Grace was a gift for the advancement of Man's indefeasible intellectual nature. But though Albert thus dwells on the high, as it were philosophic, Godhead, he reserves religiously for God a sole primary existence; he rejects with indignation his master Aristotle's tenet of the coeternity of matter and the eternity of the world;[d] but he rests not in the sublime simplicity of the Mosaic creation by the Word of God out of nothing. Since St. Augustine the Platonic doctrine of

sein. Ritter, however, does full justice to his religion, p. 191. De unitate intellectus contra Averrhoem. His works fill twenty-one volumes folio.

[d] Gott wurde bedürftig sein, wenn sein Werken eine Materie voraussetze. . . . Dass die Materie nicht ewig sein könne, wird aber auch daraus erschlossen, dass Gott, die ewige Form, und die Materie nicht mit einander gemein haben könnten, also auch nicht die Ewigkeit. Hier gebraucht Albert diesen Satz des Aristoteles gegen den Aristoteles selbst. —Ritter, pp. 201–2.

the pre-existence of the forms, or the ideas, of all things in the mind of God, had been almost the accredited doctrine of the Church. Even Matter was in God, but before it became material, only in its form and possibility. Man, indeed, seems to be doomed, if he can soar above the corporeal anthropomorphism which arrayed the Deity in human form (the anthropomorphism of the poets, the sculptors, and the painters), to admit an intellectual anthropomorphism; to endeavour to comprehend and define the laws and the capacities of the Divine Intelligence according to his own.[e] Yet when Albert thus accepted a kind of Platonic emanation theory of all things from the Godhead,[f] he repudiated as detestable, as blasphemous, the absolute unity of the Divine Intelligence with the intelligence of man. This doctrine of Averrhoes destroyed the personality of man, if not of God. He recoils from Pantheism with religious horror. His perpetual object is to draw the distinction between the Eternal and the Temporal, the Infinite and the Finite; how knowledge is attained, how the knowledge of God differs from the enthusiastic contemplation of God. God, though not to be comprehended, may be known, and that not only by grace, but by natural means. God is as the Light, everywhere seen, but everywhere escaping the comprehension of the vision. God is omnipresent, all-working, yet limited by the capacities of existing things.

God the Creator (and Creation was an eternal, inalienable attribute of the God) was conceived, as having primarily called into being four coeval things of everlasting duration,—the primal Matter, Time, Heaven, the Everlasting Intelligence.[g] But Matter, and Time, it

[e] Le Dieu des philosophes, c'est à dire des Théologiens éclairés, ne fut pas, il est vrai, celui des sculpteurs et des peintres; mais il eut bien avec lui, pour ne rien céler, quelques traits de ressemblance. Pour représenter la figure de Dieu, l'artiste avait choisi dans la nature, avec les yeux du corps, les formes qui lui avaient semblé répondre le mieux au concept idéal de la beauté parfaite, et il s'était efforcé de les reproduire sur le bois ou sur la pierre. Pour représenter Dieu comme l'intelligence parfaite, le philosophe procéda suivant la même méthode; arrivant au dernier terme de l'abstraction, il trouva dans l'entendement humain, les idées générales, et il ne sut alors mieux faire, que de définir l'intelligence de Dieu le lieu primordial de ces idées.—Haureau, p. 84. Compare the whole passage, as just as it is brilliant.

[f] Primum principium est indefinienter fluens, quo intellectus universaliter agens indesinenter est intelligentias emittens.—Apud Ritter, p. 199.

[g] Ille enim maxime intelligibilis est et omnes intellectus et intelligibilis causa et in omni intelligibili attingitur, sicut

should seem, were properly neither Matter nor Time. Matter has no proper existence, it is only privative; it is something by which and in which works Intelligence.[h] The Heavens exist (and in the Heavens, though this is something, as it were, apart from his theory, Albert admits the whole established order and succession of the Angels from Dionysius the Areopagite)[i] and Intelligence, which subsists, though oppressed and bowed down, even in lifeless things. But between the higher, imperishable intelligence of man and the intelligence of God there is nothing intermediate;[k] and yet there is eternal, irreconcileable difference. The Unity of God must develope itself in multiplicity. Man's Intelligence is a continual efflux from God, an operation of God, but yet not divine. As God it has its own Free Will.[m]

And so Albert goes on, and so went on Albert's successors, and so go on Albert's interpreters, with these exquisitely subtle distinctions of words, which they refuse to see are but words, making matter immaterial,[n] forms actual beings or substances; making God himself, with perfect free-will, act under a kind of necessity; making thoughts things, subtilising things to thoughts; beguiling themselves and beguiling mankind with the notion that they are passing the impassable barriers of human knowledge; approaching boldly, then suddenly recoiling from the most fatal conclu-

lumen quod est actus visibilium, attingitur in omni visibili per visum. Sicut tamen lumen secundum immensitatem, quam habet in rota solis et secundum immensitatem potestatis, qua omnia visibilia comprehendere potest, non potest capi vel comprehendi a visu, ita nec intellectus divinus, secundum excellentiam, qua excellit in se ipso, et secundum potestatem quâ illustrare potest super omnia, etiam super infinita intelligibilia, capi vel comprehendi potest ab intellectu creato. Summa Theolog., quoted in Ritter, p. 196. The finite cannot comprehend the Infinite. But Albert always pre-supposes the moral as well as the Christian preparative for knowledge, virtue, and faith.

[h] Ritter, p. 205.

[i] The whole Universe was a progressive descendant development, an ascendant movement towards perfection.

[k] On the great mediæval question Albert would be at once a Realist, a Conceptualist, and a Nominalist. There were three kinds of Universals, one abstract, self-existing, one in the object, one in the mind.—Ritter, p. 219. Haureau, p. 14. M. Haureau treats this part at length.

[m] Yet he does not deny, he asserts in other places, that which Christianity and Islam, Latin, Greek, and Arabian, equally admitted, the operation of God in the soul of man through Angels.

[n] Daher ist das Sein an einem jeden Geschöpfe verschieden von dem, was es ist.—Ritter, p. 211. The matter is only the outward vehicle, as it were,—the Form gives the Being. This is the theory of Averrhoes. See on this subject the just and sensible observation of M. Haureau, from page 34.

sions. In the pride and in the delight of conscious power, in the exercise of the reason, and its wonderful instrument Logic, these profound and hardy thinkers are still reproducing the same eternal problems; detaching the immaterial part of man, as it were, from his humanity, and blending him with the Godhead; bringing the Godhead down into the world, till the distinction is lost; and then perceiving and crying out in indignation against what seems their own blasphemy. The close of all Albert the Great's intense labours, of his enormous assemblage of the opinions of the philosophers of all ages, and his efforts to harmonize them with the high Christian Theology, is a kind of Eclecticism, an unreconciled Realism, Conceptualism, Nominalism, with many of the difficulties of each. The intelligence of God was but an archetype of the intelligence of man, the intelligence of man a type of that of God; each peopled with the same ideas, representatives of things, conceptional entities, even words; existing in God before all existing things, before time, and to exist after time; in man existing after existing things, born in time, yet to share in the immortality of the intelligence. Thus religion, the Christian religion, by throwing upward God into his unapproachable, ineffable, inconceivable Mystery, is perhaps, in its own province, more philosophical than philosophy. Albert, in admitting the title of the Aristotelian or Greek, or Arabian philosophy, to scrutinize, to make comprehensible the Divine Intelligence; in attempting, however glorious the attempt, the Impossible, and affixing no limits to the power of human reason and Logic, while he disturbed, to some extent unintentionally deposed, Theology, substituted no high and coherent Philosophy. Safe in his own deep religiousness, and his doctrinal orthodoxy, he saw not how with his philosophic speculations he undermined the foundations of his theology.

But this view of Albert the Great is still imperfect and unjust. His title to fame is not that he introduced and interpreted the Metaphysics and Physics of Aristotle, and the works of the Arabian philosophers on these abstruse subjects to the world, but because he opened the field of true philosophic observation to mankind. In natural history he

unfolded the more precious treasures of the Aristotelian philosophy, he revealed all the secrets of ancient science, and added large contributions of his own on every branch of it; in mathematics he commented and explained Euclid; in chymistry, he was a subtle investigator; in astronomy, a bold speculator. Had he not been premature—had not philosophy been seized and again enslaved to theology, mysticism, and worldly politics—he might have been more immediately and successfully followed by the first, if not by the second, Bacon.[o]

Thomas Aquinas.

Of all the schoolmen Thomas Aquinas[p] has left the greatest name. He was a son of the Count of Aquino, a rich fief in the Kingdom of Naples. His mother, Theodora, was of the line of the old Norman Kings; his brothers, Reginald and Landolph, held high rank in the Imperial armies. His family was connected by marriage with the Hohenstaufens; they had Swabian blood in their veins, and so the great schoolman was of the race of Frederick II. Monasticism seized on Thomas in his early youth; he became an inmate of Monte Cassino; at sixteen years of age he caught the more fiery and vigorous enthusiasm of the Dominicans. By them he was sent—no unwilling proselyte and pupil—to France. He was seized by his worldly brothers, and sent back to Naples; he was imprisoned in one of the family castles, but resisted even the fond entreaties of his mother and his sisters. He persisted in his pious disobedience, his holy hardness of heart; he was relieved after two years' imprisonment—it might seem strange—at the command of the Emperor Frederick II. The godless Emperor, as he was called, gave Thomas to the Church. Aquinas took the irrevocable vow of a Friar Preacher. He became a scholar of Albert the Great at Cologne and at Paris. He was dark,

[o] Nous n'avons interrogé que le philosophe; nous n'avons parcouru que trois ou quatre de ses vingt-un volumes in-folio, œuvre prodigieuse, presque surhumaine, à laquelle aucune autre ne saurait être comparée: que nous auraient appris, si nous avions eu le loisir de les consulter, le théologien formé à l'école des Pères, le scrupuleux investigateur des mystères de la nature, le chimiste subtil, l'audacieux astronome, l'habile interprète des théorèmes d'Euclide. Le résultat des travaux d'Albert n'a été rien moins qu'une véritable révolution! Cela résume tous ses titres à la gloire.—Haureau, ii. p. 103. He perhaps rather forboded than wrought this revolution.

[p] Born about 1227.

silent, unapproachable even by his brethren, perpetually wrapt in profound meditation. He was called, in mockery, the great dumb ox of Sicily. Albert questioned the mute disciple on the most deep and knotty points of theology; he found, as he confessed, his equal, his superior. "That dumb ox will make the world resound with his doctrines." With Albert the faithful disciple returned to Cologne. Again he went back to Paris, received his academic degrees, and taught with universal wonder. Under Alexander IV. he stood up in Rome in defence of his Order against the eloquent William de St. Amour; he repudiated for his Order, and condemned by his authority the prophecies of the Abbot Joachim. He taught at Cologne with Albert the Great; also at Paris, at Rome, at Orvieto, at Viterbo, at Perugia. Where he taught, the world listened in respectful silence. He was acknowledged by two Popes, Urban IV. and Clement IV., as the first theologian of the age. He refused the Archbishopric of Naples. He was expected at the Council of Lyons, as the authority before whom all Christendom might be expected to bow down. He died ere he had passed the borders of Naples at the Abbey of Rossa Nuova, near Terracina, at the age of forty-eight. Dark tales were told of his death;[q] only the wickedness of man could deprive the world so early of such a wonder. The University of Paris claimed but in vain, the treasure of his mortal remains.[r] He was canonised by John XXII.

Cologne, 1244, 1245.

March 2, 1274.

July 15, 1323.

Thomas Aquinas is throughout, above all, the Theologian. God and the soul of man are the only objects truly worthy of his philosophic investigation. This is the function of the Angelic Doctor, the mission of the Angel of the schools. In his works, or rather in his one great work, is the final result of all which has been decided by Pope or Council, taught by the Fathers, accepted by tradition,

[q] See vol. v. p. 91, with the quotation from Dante. One story was that Charles of Anjou had attempted violence on a niece of S. Thomas, and that the Saint had determined to denounce the crime before the Council of Lyons; others said that Charles resented the free if not king-killing doctrines of the treatise of S. Thomas de Regimine Principum. But there is a full account of the calm, pious death of S. Thomas. He was ill more than a month, with every sign of natural decay.

[r] Read the remarkable letter of the University in the Life in the Bollandists.

argued in the schools, inculcated in the Confessional. The Sum of Theology is the authentic, authoritative, acknowledged code of Latin Christianity. We cannot but contrast this vast work with the original Gospel: to this bulk has grown the New Testament, or rather the doctrinal and moral part of the New Testament.[8] But Aquinas is an intellectual theologian: he approaches more nearly than most philosophers, certainly than most divines, to pure embodied intellect. He is perfectly passionless; he has no polemic indignation, nothing of the Churchman's jealousy and suspicion; he has no fear of the result of any investigation; he hates nothing, hardly heresy; loves nothing, unless perhaps naked, abstract truth. In his serene confidence that all must end in good, he moves the most startling and even perilous questions, as if they were the most indifferent, the very Being of God. God must be revealed by syllogistic process. Himself inwardly conscious of the absolute harmony of his own intellectual and moral being, he places sin not so much in the will as in the understanding. The perfection of man is the perfection of his intelligence. He examines with the same perfect self-command, it might almost be said apathy, the converse as well as the proof of the most vital religious truths. He is nearly as consummate a sceptic, almost atheist, as he is a divine and theologian. Secure, as it should seem, in impenetrable armour, he has not only no apprehension, but seems not to suppose the possibility of danger; he has nothing of the boastfulness of self-confidence, but in calm assurance of victory, gives every advantage to his adversary. On both sides of every question he casts the argument into one of his clear, distinct syllogisms, and calmly places himself as Arbiter, and passes judgement in one or a series of still more unanswerable syllogisms. He has assigned its unassailable province to Church authority, to tradition or the Fathers, faith and works; but beyond, within the pro-

[8] My copy of the Summa of Aquinas has above twelve hundred of the very closest printed folio pages in double columns, without the indexes. I pretend not to have read it; but whoever is curious to know, as it were, the ultimate decisions of the Latin Church on most theological or ethical points will consult it; and will see the range and scope of that theology, and the groundwork of all the later casuistry.

per sphere of philosophy, he asserts full freedom. There is no Father, even St. Augustine, who may not be examined by the fearless intellect.

Thomas Aquinas has nothing like the boundless range of Albert the Great; he disdains or fears Natural Philosophy. Within their common sphere he is the faithful disciple of the master, but far surpasses him in clearness, distinctness, precision, conclusiveness. He had some works of Plato, unknown to Albert, acquired perhaps in his native Magna Græcia; but, with Albert, he rejects the co-eternal ideas subsistent without and beyond the Deity. With Albert in that controversy he is a high Aristotelian, but repudiates as decisively the eternity of matter, the imperishability of the Universe.

Aquinas has, as it were, three distinct and unmingling worlds: the world of God, the world of the immaterial angels and demons, the world of mingled matter and intelligence,—that of man. God is alone, the One absolute, infinite, self-subsistent, whose essence it is "to be." No Eastern anti-materialist ever guarded the primal Godhead more zealously from any intrusive debasement. God is his own unique form: proceeds from no antecedent form, communicates with no inferior form. The Godhead is in itself, by itself, all that is. It is pre-existent to matter, eternally separate from matter.[t] But Thomas must never lose the Christian theologian in the philosopher. All this abstract, unmingling, solitary Deity, is not merely to be endowed with his eternal, immutable attributes, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Providence, but reconciled with the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity. Thomas has not merely to avoid the errors of Plato and Aristotle, but of Arius and Sabellius; and on the Trinity he is almost as diffuse, even more minute, than on the sole original Godhead. The most microscopic eye can hardly trace his exquisite and subtle distinctions, the thin and shadowy differences of words which he creates or seizes. Yet he himself seems to walk unbewildered in his own labyrinth; he walks apparently as calmly and firmly as if he were in open day; leaves nothing unquestioned, unaccounted for;

[t] Compare Haureau, p. 155.

defines the undefinable, distinguishes the undistinguishable; and lays down his conclusions as if they were mathematical truths.

Aquinas' world of Angels and Demons comprehended the whole mystic Hierarchy of the Areopagite. Matter is not their substance; they are immaterial. They are not self-subsistent; being is not their essence.[u] They are, on one side, finite; on the other, infinite: upwards, finite; for they are limited by the stern line which divides them from the Godhead: infinite, downwards; for they seek no inferior subject. But as that which diversifies, multiplies, and individualises, is matter, and divisibility is the essential property of matter, all the Angels, thence, logically, would be but one Angel, as there is but one pure spirituality. In this point, and about the whole subject of Angels, Thomas, instead of being embarrassed, seemed to delight and revel; his luxury of distinction and definition, if it be not a contradiction, his imaginative logic, is inexhaustible. He is absolutely wanton in the questions which he starts, and answers with all the grave satisfaction as on solemn questions of life and death.[x]

The third world is that of matter and of man. The world was created by God according to forms (or ideas) existent, not without but within the Deity; for God must have known what he would create. These forms, these ideas, these types of existing things, are part of God's infinite knowledge; they are the essence of God; they are God. Man is inseparable from matter; matter cannot exist without form.[y] The soul, the intelligence of man, constitutes the third world. It shares, in some degree, the immateriality of the two higher orders. It is self-subsistent; but it needs the material body, as its organ, its instrument. It is not, however, pre-existent; Origen was a name of ill repute in the Church; his doctrine therefore, by some subtle logical effort, must be rejected. Each separate soul

[u] Esse Angeli non est essentia sed accidens.—Summa, i. quæst. xii. Art. 4. They owe their being to a free act of the divine will. Compare Haureau, p. 155.

[x] E. g. Utrum in Angelis sit cognitio matutina et vespertina. "Whether angels reason by logic" had been discussed before.

[y] God cannot create matter without form; this is a necessary limit of his omnipotence. It would be a contradiction.—Summa.

is not created ere it is infused into the human body; this creation is simultaneous; nothing uncreate is presupposed.[z] But if not self-subsistent, not possibly pre-existent, before their union with the body, how, according to the orthodox doctrine, can souls be self-subsistent after the dissolution of the union? St. Thomas takes refuge in the Angelic world. This, too, was created; and the souls, retaining the individuality, which they had acquired in their conjunction with matter, withdraw as it were into this separate immaterial and unmingling world.

It is obvious that our space only permits us to touch, and, we fear, with inevitable obscurity, some of the characteristic views of St. Thomas. St. Thomas, like his predecessor, Albert, on the great question of universals, is Eclectic; neither absolutely Realist, Conceptualist, nor Nominalist. Universals are real only in God, and but seemingly, in potentiality rather than actuality: they are subjective in the intelligence of man; they result objectively in things. St. Thomas rejects the Democritean effluxes of outward things, by which the atomistic philosophy accounted for our perceptions: he admits images of things reflected and received by the senses as by a mirror, and so brought under the cognisance of the intelligence. The intelligence has, as it were, only the power, a dormant faculty of knowledge, till the object is presented, through the image. But the conception by the senses is confused, indeterminate; till abstracted, analysed, at once universalised and individualised by the intelligence.[a]

[z] Cum anima sine corpore existens non habeat suæ naturæ perfectionem, nec Deus ab imperfectis suum opus inchoaret, simpliciter fatendum est animas simul cum corporibus creari et infundi.—Summa, i. quæst. xviii. 3. Creatio est productio alicujus rei secundum suam totam substantiam nullo præsupposito, quod sit vel increatum, vel ab aliquo creatum.—Quæst. lxv. 3.

[a] Cognitio indistincta. Ainsi la sensation est antérieure à l'intellection, c'est convenu; mais toute sensation est indéterminée, universellement confuse, avant d'être achevée, avant d'être l'acte qui la termina, c'est-à-dire l'idée individuelle de la chose sentie, le fantôme; de même l'intellection n'est devenue cette idée claire, positive, absolument distincte de tout autre, qui répond au mot humanité, qu'après un travail de l'esprit qui distrait tout le propre de l'humanité de la notion antérieure et confuse de l'animalité. On ne s'attendait peut-être pas à ce travail, chez un docteur du treizième siècle, cette savante critique de la faculté de connaître.—Haureau, p. 203. I have made this extract, not merely because it contains an important illustration of the philosophy of Aquinas, but because it is such a remarkable indication of the penetrative good sense, which, notwithstanding all his scholastic subtlety, appears, as far

Yet Thomas ruled not in uncontested supremacy even in his intellectual realm: he was encountered by an antagonist as severely intellectual as himself. No doubt the jealousy of the rival orders, the Dominican and the Franciscan, had much to do with the war of the Scotists and the Thomists, which divided the very narrow world which understood, or thought they understood, the points in dispute, and the wider world who took either side, on account of the habit, Franciscan or Dominican, of the champion. It is singular to trace, even in their Scholasticism, the ruling character, so oppugnant to each other, of the two Orders. In Albert the Great, and in St. Thomas, there is something staid, robust, muscular, the calmness of conscious strength; their reasoning is more sedate, if to such a subject the term may be applied, more practical. The intelligence of man is to be trained by severe discipline to the height of knowledge; and knowledge is its high ultimate reward. With the Franciscans there is still passion: in Bonaventura, the mild passion of Mysticism; in Duns Scotus, if it may be so said, Logic itself is become a passion. Duns is, by nature, habit, training, use, a polemic. In Ockham it is a revolutionary passion in philosophy as in politics. The true opposite, indeed rival he may be called, of Thomas, was his contemporary, his friend Bonaventura. These two men were to have met at the Council of Lyons. One died on the road, the other just lived to receive his Cardinal's hat, with the full applause of that great Œcumenic Synod: a Pope, an Emperor, and a King, attended his magnificent funeral. In Bonaventura the philosopher *recedes*; religious edification is his mission. A much smaller proportion of his voluminous works is pure Scholasticism: he is teaching by the Life of his Holy Founder, St. Francis, and by what may be called a new Gospel, a legendary Life of the Saviour, which seems to claim, with all its wild traditions, equal right to the belief with that of the Evangelists. Bonaventura himself seems to deliver it as his own unques-

Franciscans.

Bonaventura.

as my narrow acquaintance with his works, to set Aquinas above all Schoolmen. I have read the splendid quarto volume of M. Carle, 'Histoire de la Vie et des Écrits de S. Thomas d'Aquin,' of which I much admire the—type.

tioning faith. Bonaventura, if not ignorant of, feared or disdained to know much of Aristotle or the Arabians: he philosophises only because in his age he could not avoid philosophy. The philosophy of Bonaventura rests on the theological doctrine of Original Sin: the soul, exiled from God, must return to God. The most popular work of Bonaventura, with his mystic admirers, was the Itinerary of the Soul to God. The love of God, and the knowledge of God, proceed harmoniously together, through four degrees or kinds of light. The external light, by which we learn the mechanic arts: the inferior light, which shines through the senses, by these we comprehend individuals or things: the internal light, the reason, which by reflection raises the soul to intellectual things, to universals in conception: the superior light of grace, which reveals to us the sanctifying virtues, shows us universals, in their reality, in God.

Bonaventura rests not below this highest light.[b] Philosophy pretends that it may soar to the utmost heights, and behold the Invisible; it presumes to aver that thought, by dwelling on God, may behold him in spirit and in truth. Against this doctrine Bonaventura protests with all his energy. Reason may reach the ultimate bounds of nature: would it trespass farther, it is dazzled, blinded by excess of light. Is faith in the intellect or in the affections? it enlightens the intellect, it rules over the affections. Which has the greater certitude, knowledge or faith? There must be a distinction. There is a knowledge which is confined to human things. There is a knowledge which is the actual vision of God. This ultimate knowledge, though of faith, is superior to faith; it is its absolute perfection. There is a certainty of speculation, a certainty of adhesion. The certainty of adhesion is the certainty of faith; for this men have died. What Geometer ever died to vindicate the certainty of geometry?[c] All this lower

[b] From Haureau, p. 224.

[c] Est enim certitudo speculationis et est certitudo adhæsionis; et prima quidem respicit intellectum, secunda vero respicit ipsum affectum. . . . Sic major est certitudo in ipsa fide quod sit in habitu scientiæ, pro eo quod vera fides magis facit adhærere ipsum credentem veritati creditæ, quam aliqua scientia alicujus rei scitæ. Videmus enim veros fideles nec per argumenta, nec per tormenta, nec per blandimenta, inclinari posse ut veritatem quam credunt, saltem ore tenus, negent. Stultus etiam esset *geometra* qui pro quacunque certâ conclusione geometriæ, auderet subire mor-

knowledge ought to be disdainfully thrown aside for the knowledge of God. All sensible appearances, all intellectual operations, should be dismissed; the whole weight of the affections be fixed and centred on the one absolute essence in God. The faithful Christian, if he might know the whole of physical science, would, in his loyal adhesion to his belief, lose all that science rather than abandon or deny one article of the faith. The raptures of Bonaventura, like the raptures of all Mystics, tremble on the borders of Pantheism: he would still keep up the distinction between the soul and God; but the soul must aspire to absolute unity with God, in whom all ideas are in reality one, though many according to human thought and speech. But the soul, by contemplation, by beatific vision, is, as it were, to be lost and merged in that Unity.[d]

Duns Scotus.

Where the famous Duns Scotus was born, in Scotland, in Ireland, in Northumberland; why called the Scot, what was his parentage, all is utter darkness, thick and impenetrable as his own writings, from whence some derived his Greek name, Scotos. He appeared a humble Franciscan at Oxford; the subtle Doctor gathered around him 30,000 pupils. At Paris he was not heard by less eager or countless crowds. From Paris he went to Cologne, and there died. The vast writings of Duns Scotus, which as lectures thousands thronged to hear, spread out as the dreary sandy wilderness of philosophy; if its border be now occasionally entered by some curious traveller, he may return with all the satisfaction, but hardly the reward, of a discoverer. The toil, if the story of his early death be true, the rapidity of this man's mental productiveness, is perhaps the most wonderful fact in the intellectual history of our race. He is said to have died at the age of thirty-four, a

tem.—In Sentent. xxiii. quæst. 11 a 14, quoted by Haureau, p. 226. Strange prediction of Galileo! Verus fidelis etiam si sciret totam physicam, mallet totam illam scientiam perdere, quam unum solum articulum perdere vel negare, adeo adhærens veritati creditæ.—Ibid.

[d] Et quoniam cognoscens est unum, et cognita sunt multa, ideo omnes ideæ in Deo sunt unum, secundum rem, sed tamen plures secundum rationem intelligendi sive dicendi.—In Intel. i. xxv. 1-3, quoted by Ritter, p. 496. Tu autem, o amice, circa mysticas visiones corroborato itinere et sensus desere et intellectuales operationes et sensibilia et invisibilia, et omne non ens et ens, et ad unitatem, ut possibile est, inscius restituere ipsius, qui est super omnem essentiam et scientiam. Itin. Ment. ad Deum, 2, 5, 7.—Ibid. p. 498.

period at which most minds are hardly at their fullest strength, having written thirteen closely-printed folio volumes, without an image, perhaps without a superfluous word, except the eternal logical formularies and amplifications.[e] These volumes do not contain his Sermons and Commentaries, which were of endless extent. The mind of Duns might seem a wonderful reasoning machine; whatever was thrown into it came out in syllogisms: of the coarsest texture, yet in perfect flawless pattern. Logic was the idol of Duns; and this Logic-worship is the key to his whole philosophy. Logic was asserted by him not to be an art, but a science; ratiocination was not an instrument, a means for discovering truth: it was an ultimate end; its conclusions were truth. Even his language was Logic-worship. The older Schoolmen preserved something of the sound, the flow, the grammatical construction, we must not say of Cicero or Livy, but of the earlier Fathers, especially of St. Augustine. The Latinity of Duns is a barbarous jargon.[f] His subtle distinctions constantly demanded new words: he made them without scruple. It would require the most patient study, as well as a new Dictionary, to comprehend his terms. Logic being a science, not an art, the objects about which it was conversant are not representatives of things, but real things; the conceptions of human thought, things, according to the Thomist theory, of second intention, are here as things of first intention, actual as subsistent. Duns, indeed, condescended to draw a distinction between pure and applied Logic; the vulgar applied Logic might be only an instrument; the universals, the entities of pure logic, asserted their indefeasible reality. Duns Scotus is an Aristotelian beyond Aristotle, a Platonist beyond Plato; at the same time, the most sternly orthodox of Theologians.[g]

[e] Haureau adopts this account of the age of Duns without hesitation; it has been controverted, however, rather from the incredibility of the fact than from reasons drawn from the very few known circumstances or dates of his life. See Schrœck. xxiv. 437. Trithemius, a very inaccurate writer, makes him a hearer of Alexander Hales in 1245; if so, at his death in 1308 he must have been above seventy. But no doubt the authority, whoever he was, of Trithemius wrote Scholar (follower), not Hearer.

[f] Scotus has neither the philosophic dignity nor the calm wisdom of Thomas; he is rude, polemic. He does not want theologic hatred. Saraceni—vilissimi porci—asini Manichei. Ille maledictus Averrhoes.—Ritter, p. 360.

[g] Die Richtung, welche er seiner Wissenschaft gegeben hat, ist durchaus kirchlich.—Ritter, p. 336.

On the eternity of matter he transcends his master: he accepts the hardy saying of Avicembron,[h] of the universality of matter. He carries matter not only higher than the intermediate world of Devils and Angels, but up into the very Sanctuary, into the Godhead itself. And how is this? by dematerialising matter, by stripping it of everything, which, to the ordinary apprehension, and not less to philosophic thought, has distinguished matter; by spiritualising it to the purest spirituality. Matter only became material by being conjoined with form. Before that it subsisted potentially only, abstract, unembodied, immaterial; an entity conceivable alone, but as being conceivable, therefore real. For this end the Subtle Doctor created, high above all vulgar common matter, a primary primal, a secondary primal, a tertiary primal matter; and yet this matter was One. The universal Primary primal matter is in all things; but as the secondary primal matter has received the double form of the corruptible and incorruptible, it is shared between these two. The tertiary primal matter distributes itself among the infinite species, which range under these genera.[i] It is strange to find Scholasticism, in both its opposite paths, gliding into Pantheism. An universal infinite Matter, matter refined to pure Spiritualism, comprehending the finite, sounds like the most extreme Spinosism. But Scotus, bewildered by his own skilful word juggling, perceives not this, and repudiates the consequence with indignation. God is still with him the high, remote

[h] Je reviens, dit-il, à la thèse d'Avicembron (ego autem ad positionem Avicembronis redeo), et je soutiens d'abord que toute substance créée, corporelle ou spirituelle, participe de la matière. Je prouve ensuite que cette matière est une en tous—quod sit unica materia.—Haureau, p. 328. Selbst die Materie, obwohl sie die nidrigste von allem Seienden ist, must doch also ein Seiendes gedacht werden und hat ihre Idee in Gott.—Ritter, p. 432. The modern Baconian philosophy may appear in one sense to have reached the same point as the metaphysical philosophy of Duns Scotus, to have subtilised matter into immateriality, to have reached the point where the distinction between the spiritual and material seems to be lost, and almost mocks definition. It is arrived at centres, of force, powers impalpable, imponderable, infinite. But it is one thing to refine away all the qualities of matter by experiment, and to do it by stripping words of their conventional meaning. Mr. Faraday's discoveries and his fame will not meet the fate of Duns Scotus.

[i] Dicitur materia secundo prima quæ est subjectum generationis et corruptionis, quam mutant et transmutant agentia creata, seu angeli seu agentia corruptibilia; quæ ut dixi, addit ad materiam primo primam, quia esse subjectum generationis non potest sine aliquâ formâ substantiali aut sine quantitate, quæ sunt extra rationem materiæ primo primæ.—Haureau.

Monad, above all things, though throughout all things.[k] In him, and not without him, according to what is asserted to be Platonic doctrine, are the forms and ideas of things. With equal zeal, and with equal ingenuity with the Thomists, he attempts to maintain the free will of God, whom he seems to have bound in the chain of inexorable necessity.[m] He saves it by a distinction which even his subtlety can hardly define. Yet, behind and without this nebulous circle, Duns Scotus, as a metaphysical and an ethical writer, is remarkable for his bold speculative views on the nature of our intelligence, on its communication with the outward world, by the senses, by its own innate powers, as well as by the influence of the superior Intelligence. He thinks with perfect freedom; and if he spins his spider-webs, it is impossible not to be struck at once by their strength and coherence. Translate him, as some have attempted to translate him, into intelligible language, he is always suggestive, sometimes conclusive.

The war of Scotists and Thomists long divided the Schools, not the less fierce from the utter darkness in which it was enveloped. It is not easy to define in what consisted their implacable, unforgiven points of difference. If each combatant had been compelled rigidly to define every word or term which he employed, concord might not perhaps have been impossible; but words were their warfare, and the war of words their business, their occupation, their glory. The Conceptualism or Eclecticism of St. Thomas (he cannot be called a Nominalist) admitted so much Realism, under other forms of speech; the Realism of Duns Scotus was so absolutely a Realism of words, reality

[k] Haureau, p. 359.

[m] L'origine de toutes les erreurs propagées au sujet de la Création vient, dit-il, de ce que les philosophes ont témérairement assimilé la volonté divine à la volonté humaine; aussi combat-il de toutes ses forces cette assimilation, sans réussir, toutefois, à démêler d'une manière satisfaisante ce que c'est la détermination temporelle d'une acte éternelle.—Haureau, p. 363. The reader who may be curious to learn how Duns Scotus solves other important physical and metaphysical questions, the principle of motion, the personality and immortality of the soul, will do well to read the chapters of M. Haureau, compared, if he will, with the heavier synopsis of Brucker, the neater of Tenneman, the more full and elaborate examination of Ritter. Ritter dwells more on the theological and ethical part of the system of Duns Scotus, whom he ranks not only as the most acute and subtlest, but, as should seem, the highest of the Schoolmen. The pages in which he traces the theory of Scotus respecting the means by which our knowledge is acquired are most able, and full of interest for the metaphysical reader.

was with him something so thin and unsubstantial; the Augustinianism of St. Thomas was so guarded and tempered by his high ethical tone, by his assertion of the loftiest Christian morality; the Pelagianism charged against Scotus is so purely metaphysical, so balanced by his constant, for him vehement, vindication of Divine grace,[n] only with notions peculiar to his philosophy, of its mode of operation, and with almost untraceable distinctions as to its mode of influence, that nothing less than the inveterate pugnacity of Scholastic Teaching, and the rivalry of the two Orders, could have perpetuated the strife.[o] That strife was no doubt heightened and embittered by their real differences, which touched the most sensitive part of the Mediæval Creed the worship of the Virgin. This was coldly and irreverently limited by the refusal of the Dominican to acknowledge her Immaculate Conception and birth; wrought to a height above all former height by the passionate maintenance of that tenet in every Franciscan cloister, by every Franciscan Theologian.

William of Ockham.

But, after all, the mortal enemy of the Franciscan scholasticism was in the Franciscan camp. The religious mysticism of Bonaventura, the high orthodox subtilism of Duns Scotus, were encountered by a more dangerous antagonist. The schism of Franciscanism was propagated into its philosophy; the Fraticelli, the Spiritualists, must have their champion in the Schools, and that champion in ability the equal of those without and those within their Order, of Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus. As deep in the very depths of metaphysics, as powerful a wielder of the great arm of the war, Logic; more fearless and peremptory as less under

[n] Ritter, p. 359. He is not only orthodox on this point; he is hierarchical to the utmost. He adopts the phrase ascribed to St. Augustine, that he would not believe the Gospel but on the witness of the Church. The power of the keys he extends not only to temporal but to eternal punishments—doch mit dem Zusatze, dass hierbei, so wie in andern Dingen der Priester nur als Werkzeug Gottes handle, welcher selbst eines bösen Engels sich bedienen könnte um einer gültige Taufe zu voll-ziehn.—Scotus draws a distinction (he saves everything by a distinction which his subtlety never fails to furnish) between the absolute and secondary will of God.

[o] Ritter thinks their philosophy vitally oppugnant (p. 364), but it is in reconciling their philosophy with the same orthodox theology that they again approximate. One defines away necessity till it ceases to be necessity, the other fetters free-will till it ceases to be free.

the awe of the Church in his conclusions—William of Ockham had already shaken the pillars of the hierarchical polity, by his audacious assertion of the more than co-equal rights of the temporal Sovereign; by his stern, rigid nominalism, he struck with scholastic arguments, in the hardest scholastic method, at the foundations of the Scholastic Philosophy. William was of undistinguished birth, from the village of Ockham, in Surrey; he entered into the Franciscan order, and was sent to study theology under Duns Scotus at Paris. The quarrel of Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair was at its height. How deeply the haughty and rapacious Pope had injured the Franciscan order, especially the English Franciscans, has been told.[p] How far William of Ockham was then possessed by the resentment of his Order, how far he had inclined to the extreme Franciscanism, and condemned his own Order, as well as the proud Prelates of the Church, for their avarice of wealth, does not clearly appear. He took up boldly, unreservedly, to the utmost height, the rights of temporal Sovereigns. In his Disputation on the ecclesiastical power[q] he refused to acknowledge in the Pope any authority whatever as to secular affairs. Jesus Christ himself, as far as he was man, as far as he was a sojourner in this mortal world, had received from his heavenly Father no commission to censure Kings; the partisans of the Papal temporal omnipotence were to be driven as heretics from the Church. In the strife of his Order with John XXII., William of Ockham is, with Michael of Cesena and Bonagratia, the fearless assertor of absolute poverty.[r] These men confronted the Pope in his power, in his pride, in his wealth. The Defence of Poverty by William of Ockham was the most dauntless, the most severely reasoned, the most sternly consequent, of the addresses poured forth to astonished Christendom by these daring Revolutionists. Pope John commanded A.D. 1323. the Bishops of Ferrara and Bologna to examine and condemn this abominable book. Five years after, William of Ockham, with Michael de Cesena and Bonagratia, were

[p] See vol. v. p. 213.

[q] Disputatio super potestate ecclesiasticâ prælatis atque principibus terrarum commissâ.—In Goldastus de Monarchia. Compare Haureau, p. 419.

[r] Apud Brown, Fasciculus.

arraigned at Avignon, and in close custody, for their audacious opinions. William of Ockham might already, if he had any fear, shudder at the stake and the fire in which had perished so many of his brethren. They fled, took ship at Aigues Mortes, found their way to the Court of Louis of Bavaria. They were condemned by the Pope, cast off by their own Order, who at the Synod of Perpignan renounced the brotherhood of these men, who denounced their wealth, as well as that of the Pope, and would admit nothing less than absolute, more than apostolic poverty. Their sentence was that of heretics and schismatics, deprivation of all privileges, perpetual imprisonment. But William of Ockham, in the Court of Louis, at Munich, laughed to scorn and defied their idle terrors. He became the champion of the Imperial rights, of the Franciscan Antipope, Peter of Corbara. He did not live to put to shame by his firmer, and more resolute resistance to the Pope, the timid, vacillating, yielding Louis of Bavaria.

William of Ockham was, in philosophy as intrepid and as revolutionary as in his political writings. He is a consummate schoolman in his mastery, as in his use of logic; a man who wears the armour of his age, engages in the spirit of his age, in the controversies of his age; but his philosophy is that of centuries later.[s] The scholastic theologian can discuss with subtlety equal to the subtlest, whether Angelic natures can be circumscribed in a certain place; the Immaculate birth and conception of the Virgin, in which he is faithfully Franciscan; Transubstantiation, in which he enters into the most refined distinctions, yet departs not from the dominant doctrine. As a philosopher Ockham reverently secludes the Godhead[t] from his inves-

[s] Quodlibeta. Compare Schroeckh. xxxiv. 196-7.

[t] Quodlibet ii. quæst. ii. Haureau, 422.—In another part M. Haureau sums up Ockham's awful reserve on the notion of God so boldly formed by the older Schoolmen: "C'est précisément cette notion rationnelle de la substance divine que Guillaume d'Ockham critique et réduit à un concept arbitrairement composé; composé de concepts qui expriment bien, sans doute, quelque chose de Dieu (*aliquod Dei*), mais ne désignent pas Dieu lui-même, la substance, l'essence de Dieu, *quod est Deus* . . . . cette notion abstraite de Dieu, cette notion qui, on le prouve bien, ne représente pas son objet, est la seule que possède la raison humaine, la seule qui lui permet de soupçonner, de deviner, de poser l'entité mystérieuse de la suprême cause. Faut-il désirer une connaissance plus parfaite de cette cause? Sans aucun doute; mais en attendant, il faut s'en tenir à ce qu'il sait."—p. 454. See also the preceding pages.

tigation. Logic, which deals with finite things, must not presume to discuss the Infinite First Cause. He at once, and remorselessly, destroys all the idols of the former schoolmen. Realism must surrender all her multifarious essences, her abstract virtues, her species, her ideas. Universals are but modes of thought; even the phantasms of Aquinas must disappear. Ideas are no longer things; they are the acts of the thinking being. Between the subject which knows and the object known there is nothing intermediate. The mind is one, with two modes or faculties,—sensibility and intelligence. Sensation is not sufficient to impart knowledge; there must be also an act of intelligence: the former is purely intuitive, the latter is, as it were, judicial. The difference between the sensitive and intelligent is thus partly by experience, partly by reason. By experience, the child sees through sensation, not through intelligence; by reason, because the soul, when separate, sees intellectually, but not through the senses. The sensitive vision is the potential cause of the intellectual vision, but not the potential cause of the intellectual assent. After intuition comes abstraction, sensation, or the intuitive notion, being always singular; abstraction may, as it were, insulate that which is singular, disengaging it from all its surrounding circumstances; it may introduce plurality, combine, compare, multiply. Thus ideas are simple perceptions, or conceptions, and so not only fall away the Democritean notions of actual images which have a local existence, and pass from the object to the sense, but likewise even the impressions, as of a seal, which is the doctrine of Scotus, and the real phantasms of St. Thomas.[n] Of course he denies not the images or similitude of things in the organ of sight, but they are as the reflections in a mirror: they do not precede and determine, though they accompany the sensation. The universal is but a conception of the mind; and as these conceptions are formed or perpetuated by these processes, each is the repetition, the reflection of the other, in intelligence, speech, writing. Universals are words, whether conceived, spoken, or written

[n] Dès que les idées ne sont plus comme des actes du sujet pensant, que considérées comme des choses mais de chimères s'évanouissent!—p. 439.

words, which by common consent express under one term many singular things.[x] In this sense, then, is William of Ockham a Nominalist in the strongest sense.

Thus may William of Ockham seem with fine and prophetic discrimination to have assigned their proper, indispensable, yet limited power and office to the senses; to have vindicated to the understanding its higher, separate, independent function; to have anticipated the famous axiom of Leibnitz, that there is nothing in the intellect but from the senses, except the intellect itself; to have anticipated Hobbes; foreshadowed Locke, not as Locke is vulgarly judged, according to his later French disciples, but in himself;[y] to have taken his stand on the same ground with Kant. What Abelard was to the ancestors of the Schoolmen was Ockham to the Schoolmen themselves. The schoolmen could not but eventuate in William of Ockham; the united stream could not but endeavour to work itself clear; the incessant activity of thought could hardly fail to call forth a thinker like Ockham.

Such was the character of the Scholastic Philosophy, such the chief of the scholastic philosophers, such the final assertion and vindication of the sole dominion of Latin Christianity over the mind of man. Between the close of this age, but before the birth of modern philosophy, was to come the Platonising, half Paganising school of Marsilius Ficinus: the age to end in direct rebellion, in the Italian philosophers, against Christianity itself. But it was an extraordinary fact, that in such an age, when Latin Christianity might seem at the height of its mediæval splendour and power, the age of chivalry, of Cathedral and Monastic architecture, of poetry in its romantic and religious forms, so many powerful intellects should be so incessantly busy with the metaphysics of religion; religion, not as taught by authority, but religion under philosophic guidance, with the aid, they might presume to say with the servile,

[x] "Est . . . universale, vox vel scriptum, aut quodcunque aliud signum ex meditatione vel voluntario usu, significans plura singularia universè." Quoted in Haureau, p. 469.

[y] I must be allowed to refer to the excellent article on Locke in Mr. Hallam's Literary History; and to a very elaborate and able review of this groundwork of Locke's philosophy in the 'Edinburgh Review,' lately republished among the Essays by Mr. Rogers.

the compulsory aid, of the Pagan Aristotle and the Mohammedan Arabians, but still with Aristotle and the Arabians, admitted to the honour of a hearing: not regarded as odious, impious, and godless, but listened to with respect, discussed with freedom, refuted with confessed difficulty. With all its seeming outward submission to authority, Scholasticism at last was a tacit universal insurrection against authority; it was the swelling of the ocean before the storm; it began to assign bounds to that which had been the universal all-embracing domain of Theology. It was a sign of the reawakening life of the human mind that Theologians dared, that they thought it their privilege, that it became a duty to philosophise. There was vast waste of intellectual labour; but still it was intellectual labour. Perhaps at no time in the history of man have so many minds, and those minds of great vigour and acuteness, been employed on subjects almost purely speculative. Truth was the object of research; truth, it is true, fenced about by the strong walls of authority and tradition, but still the ultimate remote object. Though it was but a trammelled reluctant liberty, liberty which locked again its own broken fetters, still it could not but keep alive, and perpetuate, the desire of more perfect, more absolute emancipation. Philosophy once heard could not be put to silence.

One man alone, Roger Bacon, even in his own day, had stood aloof from this all-absorbing Theology, this metaphysical or ontological philosophy, which, with all the rest, was the dominant aim of all profound and rigidly syllogistic investigation; the primary, if not exclusive subject-matter of all the vast volumes, in which the same questions, argued in the same forms, revolved in eternal round. Roger Bacon alone sought other knowledge, and by other processes of thought and reasoning. Not that physical, or mathematical, or even experimental sciences were absolutely disdained or proscribed among the highest Theologians: they were pursued by Albert the Great with the ardour of his all-grasping intellect. But with Roger Bacon they were the predominant master studies. Even he, on his side, could not withdraw entirely from that

which had been so long, and was to be still, so exclusively the province of all human thought, which must occupy it more or less, Theology; but the others were manifestly the engrossing pursuit, the passion, as far as such men are capable of passion, of his mind. Yet Latin Christianity can hardly lay claim to the glory, whatever that might be, of Roger Bacon. The Church, which could boast her Albert, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, repudiated Roger Bacon with jealous suspicion. That which is his fame in later days, heaped on him, in his own, shame and persecution. For at least ten years he was in prison; it is not quite clear that he ever emerged from that prison. Yet, though he has no proper place, though he is no way the son or the scholar of Latin Christianity, yet, in justice to the rulers in Latin Christendom, as well as characterising their rule (the exceptional man often throws the strongest light on the times), must be instituted a more close, yet still rapid, investigation into the extent and causes of the persecution of Roger Bacon.

Born about 1214.

At Oxford, his first place of study, Roger Bacon was remarked for his zeal in mathematical and scientific studies.[z] But Paris was at that time to Transalpine Christendom what Athens was to later Rome. Without having attended lectures at Paris, no one could aspire to learned, or philosophical, or theological eminence. At Paris his great talent and acquirements obtained him the name of the "Wonderful Doctor." It was at Paris no doubt that he matured those studies, which he afterwards developed in his "Greater Work."[a] He could not but excite wonder; doubtless he did excite more than wonder, for he dared to throw off entirely the bondage of the Aristotelian logic. When he judged Aristotle, it should seem, only by those parts of his works, matured in the Dialectics of the Schools, he would have been the Omar of Aristotle; he would willingly have burned all his books, as wasting time,

[z] It is disputed whether at Merton College or Brazenose Hall. As Bacon was not a member of Merton College, according to the fashion of the day he may possibly at different times have lodged both in one and in the other. The halls were merely places of residence for Scholars.

[a] The Opus Majus.

as causes of error, and a multiplication of ignorance.[b] But Aristotle, as a philosopher, especially as commented by Avicenna, after Aristotle the prince of philosophers, is the object of his profound reverence. The studies of Roger Bacon embraced every branch of physical science, Astronomy, Optics, Mechanics, Chemistry. He seems even to have had some glimpses of that which has first grown into a science in our own day. He was an industrious student of all languages, Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, the modern tongues. He had a dim notion of their kindred and filiation. He had a vision of a Universal Grammar, by which all languages were to be learned in an incredibly short space of time.[c] In Paris his fellow-student was the famous Robert Grostête: the intimate friendship of such a man could but commend him to the favour of some of the loftier Churchmen. He returned to Oxford, and in an evil hour took the fatal step (it is said by the advice of Grostête, who was infatuated with the yet ardent zeal of the Franciscans) of becoming a Franciscan Friar. Thus he became not merely subject to the general discipline of the Church, but to the narrower, more rigid, more suspicious rule of the Order.[d] It was difficult for a man of great powers to escape being Dominican or Franciscan. The Dominicans were severe and jealously orthodox. The Inquisition was entrusted to them; but they had a powerful and generous corporate spirit, and great pride in men of their own Order who showed transcendent abilities.

[b] "Si haberem potestatem super libros Aristotelis, ego facerem omnes cremari, quia non est nisi temporis amissio studere in illis, et causa erroris, et multiplicati erroris." See on the translators of Aristotle, Opus Majus, quoted by Jebb in Præfat. i. c. viii.

[c] As his astronomy sometimes tampered with astrology, his chemistry degenerated into alchemy, so his knowledge of languages was not without what, in modern times, might be branded as charlatanism. He professed that, according to his Universal Grammar, he could impart to an apt and diligent scholar a knowledge of Hebrew in three days, of Greek in as many more. "Certum est mihi quod intra tres dies quemcunque diligentem et confidentem docerem Hebræum et simul legere et intelligere quicquid sancti dicunt et sapientes antiqui in expositione sacri textûs, et quicquid pertinet ad illius textûs correctionem, et expositionem, si vellet se exercere secundum doctrinam doctam: et per tres dies sciret de Græco iterum, ut non solum sciret legere et intelligere quicquid pertinet ad theologiam, sed ad philosophiam et ad linguam Latinam."—Epist. de Laud. S. Script. ad P. Clement. IV. Here too he is breaking up the way to Biblical criticism.

[d] According to some he became a Franciscan at Paris.

The Franciscan Generals were, with the exception perhaps of John of Parma, and of St. Bonaventura, men of mean talent, of contracted and jealous minds, with all the timidity of ignorance.[e] The persecutor of Roger Bacon was Jerome of Ascoli, the General of his own Order; first when as Cardinal he was aspiring towards the steps of the Papal throne; afterwards when he ascended that throne as Nicolas IV.[f] Nor indeed were wanting at that time causes which might seem to justify this ungenerous timidity in the Franciscans. They were watched with the jealousy of hatred by the Dominicans. Masters of the Inquisition, the Dominicans would triumph in the detection of Franciscan heretics. There had been already the first rending of their body by the fatal schism, under John of Parma, hardly allayed by the gentle and commanding rule of Bonaventura. The fierce democratic Ghibellinism was even now fermenting among them, hereafter to break out in the Anti-Papal writings of William of Ockham. Roger Bacon himself might seem disposed to tamper with perilous politics. On his return to Oxford, he preached, it is said, before King Henry III., and denounced, in no measured terms, the employment of French and Gascon Nobles and Prelates in the great offices of State; the prodigality of the King towards these foreign favourites; his blind confidence in the Bishop of Winchester; his placing foreign Poitevins in possession of the chief forts and strongholds in the realm. Even in his own Order, Roger Bacon is said to have shown the natural contempt of a man of his high acquirements for the ignorance and superstition of his brethren; to have let fall alarming words about Reform in the Franciscan Convents. Yet was he not without powerful friends; Grostête, of Lincoln, and, after Grostête's death, men at least of wealth and liberality. He is reported to have received at Oxford no less a sum

[e] "Les Franciscains, toujours gouvernés, si l'on excepte Saint Bonaventura, par des généraux d'un menu talent et d'un médiocre savoir, ne se sentaient qu'humiliés de la présence et de la gloire des hommes de mérite, qui s'étaient égarés parmi eux."—M. V. de Clerc, Hist. Lit. de la France, xx. p. 230.

[f] Jerome d'Ascoli was at Paris, the probable date of Bacon's persecution in 1278. I cannot but doubt the date usually assigned to his birth.

than 2,000 Paris livres for books and instruments. Even the Church as yet seemed more disposed to admire and to honour, than to look with cold suspicion on the wonderful man. Pope Clement IV. accepted the dedication of the Work which contained all the great principles of his philosophy; all on which his awe-struck brethren looked as fearful magic. He received the work itself with some instruments invented by Bacon to illustrate his experiments. These Bacon, notwithstanding the direct prohibition of the Rulers of his Order, who threatened him with the forfeiture of his book, and the penalty of confinement on bread and water, if he dared to communicate with any one what might be his unlawful discoveries,[g] despatched through John of Paris to Rome. Philosophy was thus as it were entering its appeal to the Pope. Clement IV. was a Frenchman; no doubt knew the fame of Bacon at Paris. He had written a letter to Bacon entreating the communication of his famous wonders. Bacon had not dared to answer this letter till Clement was on the Papal throne; and even the Pope himself dared not openly to receive this appeal of philosophy. He stipulated that the books and the instruments should be sent as secretly as possible.[h] For the ten years which followed the death of Clement IV., Bacon lived an object of wonder, terror, suspicion, and of petty persecution by his envious or his superstitious brethren. He attempted to propitiate Honorius IV. by a treatise on 'The Mitigation of the Inconveniences of Old Age.'[i] At the close of these ten years, came to Paris, as Legate from Pope Nicolas III., Jerome of Ascoli, General of the Franciscan Order. Jerome was a true Franciscan; and before him the Franciscans found ready audience in the arraignment of that fearful magician, their Brother. It is singular that among the specific charges was that of undertaking to

A.D. 1266.

Clement IV. Pope. 1265-1268.

A.D. 1268-1278.

[g] "Sub præcepto et pœnâ amissionis libri et jejunio in pane et aquâ pluribus diebus, prohibuerunt eum a communicando scriptum aliquod a se factum cum aliis quibuscunque."—Opus Majus, M.S. Cott. fol. 3.

[h] "Hoc quanto secretius poteris, facies."—Wadding, Ann. 11, p. 294, quoted in an extremely good article on Roger Bacon in Didot's new Biographie Universelle, which has avoided or corrected many errors in the old biographies.

[i] Honorius IV. not Nicolas IV. See Hist. Lit. de la France, p. 232.

predict future events. Bacon's own words show that the charge, however puerile, was true: "But for the stupidity of those employed, he would have framed astronomical tables, which, by marking the times when the heavenly bodies were in the same positions and conjunctions, would have enabled him to vaticinate their influence on human affairs."[k] That which to us was the rare folly of a wise man, to his own age was the crime of a wicked one. The general accusation was far more wide and indefinite, and from its definiteness more terrible. It was a compact with the Devil, from whom alone he had obtained his wonderful knowledge, and wrought his wonderful works. In vain Bacon sent out his contemptuous and defiant treatise on the nullity of magic: "Because things are above your shallow understandings, you immediately declare them works of the Devil." In such words he arraigns not the vulgar alone: "Theologians and Canonists, in their ignorance, abhor these things, as works of magic, and unbecoming a Christian." And thus the philosopher spoke against his whole Order; and before a Cardinal Legate, a Master of that Order. Roger Bacon was consigned to a Monastic dungeon at least for ten years; and as it is not likely that Jerome of Ascoli, as Pope, would mitigate the rigour, no doubt conscientiously exercised, most probably for five years more, till the close of the Pontificate of Nicolas IV. If he emerged from the darkness of his prison, it was not more than a year before his death.

The value and extent of Roger Bacon's scientific discoveries, or prophecies of discoveries, how far his own, or derived from Arabian sources, belongs rather to the history of philosophy than of Latin Christianity. His astronomy no doubt had enabled him to detect the error in the Julian year: three centuries too soon he proposed to Clement IV. to correct the Calendar by his Papal authority, but I pre-

[k] Throughout Bacon's astrological section (read from p. 237), the heavenly bodies act entirely through their physical properties, cold, heat, moisture, drought. The comet causes war (he attributes the wars then raging in Europe to a comet) not as a mere arbitrary sign, nor as by magic influence (all this he rejects as anile superstition), but as by its intense heat inflaming the blood and passions of men. It is an exaggeration (unphilosophical enough) of the influences of the planetary bodies, and the powers of human observation to trace their effects, but very different from what is ordinarily conceived of judicial astrology.

sume not to enter further into this or kindred subjects. In Optics his admirers assert that he had found out many remarkable laws, the principle of the Telescope, the Refraction of Light, the cause of the Rainbow. He framed burning glasses of considerable magnitude. Mechanics were among his favourite and most successful studies. In his Chemistry he had reached, or nearly reached, the invention of gunpowder: it is more certain that he sought the philosopher's stone, or at least a transmuting elixir with unlimited powers. There are passages about mounting in the air without wings, and self-moving carriages, travelling at vast speed without horses, which sound like vaticinations of still more wonderful things. He had no doubt discovered the cause of the tides. It is for others, too, to decide how far in the general principles of his philosophy he had anticipated his greater namesake, or whether it was more than the sympathy of two kindred minds working on the same subjects, which led to some singular yet very possibly fortuitous coincidences of thought and expression.[m] This, however, is certain, that although the second Bacon's great work, as addressed to Europe, might condescend to the Latin form, it was in its strong copious Teutonic English that it wrought its revolution, that it became the great fountain of English thought, of English sagacity, the prelude to and the rule of English scientific discovery.

Roger Bacon has rather thrown us back in our chronology to the age of the older Scholasticism; but Scholasticism ruled supreme almost to the close of exclusive Latin Christianity; it expired only by degrees; its bonds were loosened, but not cast off: if its forms had given place to others more easy, natural, rhetorical, its modes of thought, its processes of ratiocination, its logic, and its definitions, still swathed the dead body of Christian Theology. Gerson was still in a great degree a schoolman, Wycliffe himself at Oxford was a schoolman. But Latin Christianity was not all scholastic theology, it was religion also; it did not altogether forget to be piety, holiness,

[m] See Mr. Forster's 'Mohammedanism Unveiled,' and Mr. Hallam's judicious remarks. Lit. Hist.

charity; it was not content with its laborious endeavours to enlighten the mind; it knew still that the heart was its proper domain. The religious feelings, the religious affections, the religious emotions, were not abandoned for the eternal syllogisms of the schools, the interminable process of twentyfold assertion, twentyfold objection, twentyfold conclusion. It was not enough that the human intelligence should be taught that it was an efflux, a part of the Divine intelligence. Nor was the higher office of training the soul of man to communion with Christ by faith, purity, and love, altogether left to what may be called Scholastic Mysticism. In one remarkable book was gathered and concentered all that was elevating, passionate, profoundly pious, in all the older mystics. Gerson, Rysbroek, Tauler, all who addressed the heart in later times, were summed up, brought into one circle of light and heat, in the single small volume, the 'Imitation of Christ.' That this book supplied some imperious want in the Christianity of mankind, that it supplied it with a fullness and felicity, which left nothing, at this period of Christianity, to be desired, its boundless popularity is the one unanswerable testimony. No book has been so often reprinted, no book has been so often translated, or into so many languages, as the 'Imitation of Christ.'[n] The mystery of its authorship in other cases might have added to its fame and circulation; but that mystery was not wanted in regard to the 'Imitation.' Who was the author—Italian, German, French, Fleming?[o] With each of these races it is taken up as a question of national vanity. Was it the work of Priest, Canon, Monk? This, too, in former times, was debated with the eagerness of rival Orders.[p] The size

Imitation of Christ.

[n] According to M. Michelet (whose rhapsody, as usual, contains much which is striking truth, much of his peculiar sentimentalism) there are sixty translations into French; in some respects he thinks the French translation, the 'Consolation,' more pious and touching than the original.

[o] Italian, French, German idioms have been detected.

[p] Several recent writers, especially M. Onésime Roy, 'Études sur les Mystères,' have thought that they have proved it to be by the famous Gerson. If any judgement is to be formed from Gerson's other writings, the internal evidence is conclusive against him. M. Michelet has some quotations from Thomas à Kempis, the author at least of a thick volume published under that name, which might seem equally to endanger his claim. But to me, though inferior, the other devotional works there ascribed to Thomas à Kempis, the Soliloquium Animæ, the Hortulus Rosarum, and Vallis Lilium, even the

of the book, the manner, the style, the arrangement, as well as its profound sympathy with all the religious feelings, wants, and passions; its vivid and natural expressions, to monastic Christianity what the Hebrew Psalms are to our common religion, to our common Christianity; its contagious piety; all conspired to its universal dissemination, its universal use. This one little volume contained in its few pages the whole essence of the St. Victors, of Bonaventura without his Franciscan peculiarities, and of the later mystic school. Yet it might be easily held in the hand, carried about where no other book was borne,—in the narrow cell or chamber, on the journey, into the solitude, among the crowd and throng of men, in the prison. Its manner, its short, quivering sentences, which went at once to the heart; and laid hold of and clung tenaciously to the memory with the compression and completeness of proverbs;[q] its axioms, each of which suggested endless thought; its imagery, scriptural and simple, were alike original, unique. The style is ecclesiastical Latin, but the perfection of ecclesiastical Latin—brief, pregnant, picturesque; expressing profound thoughts in the fewest words, and those words, if compared with the scholastics, of purer Latin sound or construction. The facility with which it passed into all other languages, those especially of Roman descent, bears witness to its perspicuity, vivacity, and energy. Its arrangement has something of the consecutive progress of an ancient initiation; it has its commencement, its middle, and its close; discriminating yet leading up the student in constant ascent; it is an epopee of the internal history of the human soul.

The 'Imitation of Christ' both advanced and arrested the development of Teutonic Christianity; it was prophetic of its approach, as showing what was demanded of the human soul, and as endeavouring, in its own way, to supply that imperative necessity; yet by its deficiency, as a manual of universal religion, of eternal Christianity, it

Sermons, if not quite so pure, are more than kindred, absolutely the same, in thought and language and style. See the Opera T. à Kempis: Antwerp, 1515.

[q] It is singular how it almost escapes or avoids that fatal vulgarism of most mystic works, metaphors taken from our lower senses, the taste, the touch.

showed as clearly that the human mind, the human heart, could not rest in the Imitation. It acknowledged, it endeavoured to fill up the void of *personal* religion. The Imitation is the soul of man working out its own salvation, with hardly any aid but the confessed necessity of divine grace. It may be because it is the work of an ecclesiastic, a Priest, or Monk, but, with the exception of the exhortation to frequent communion, there is nothing whatever of sacerdotal intervention; all is the act, the obedience, the aspiration, the self-purification, self-exaltation of the soul. It is the Confessional in which the soul confesses to itself, absolves itself; it is the Direction by whose sole guidance the soul directs itself. The Book absolutely and entirely supersedes and supplies the place of the spiritual teacher, the spiritual guide, the spiritual comforter: it is itself that teacher, guide, comforter. No manual of Teutonic devotion is more absolutely sufficient. According to its notion of Christian perfection, Christian perfection is attainable by its study, and by the performance of its precepts: the soul needs no other mediator, at least no earthly mediator, for its union with the Lord.

But 'The Imitation of Christ,' the last effort of Latin Christianity, is still monastic Christianity. It is absolutely and entirely selfish in its aim, as in its acts. Its sole, single, exclusive object, is the purification, the elevation of the individual soul, of the man absolutely isolated from his kind, of the man dwelling alone in the solitude, in the hermitage of his own thoughts; with no fears or hopes, no sympathies of our common nature: he has absolutely withdrawn, and secluded himself not only from the cares, the sins, the trials, but from the duties, the connections, the moral and religious fate of the world. Never was misnomer so glaring, if justly considered, as the title of the book, the 'Imitation of Christ.' That which distinguishes Christ, that which distinguishes Christ's Apostles, that which distinguishes Christ's religion—the Love of Man—is entirely and absolutely left out. Had this been the whole of Christianity, our Lord himself (with reverence be it said) had lived, like an Essene, working out or displaying his own sinless perfection by the Dead Sea: neither on the Mount, nor

in the Temple, nor even on the Cross. The Apostles had dwelt entirely on the internal emotions of their own souls, each by himself, St. Peter still by the Lake of Gennesareth, St. Paul in the desert of Arabia, St. John in Patmos. Christianity had been without any exquisite precept for the purity, the happiness of social or domestic life; without self-sacrifice for the good of others; without the higher Christian patriotism, devotion on evangelic principles to the public weal; without even the devotion of the missionary for the dissemination of Gospel truth; without the humbler and gentler daily self-sacrifice for relatives, for the wife, the parent, the child. Christianity had never soared to be the civiliser of the world. "Let the world perish, so the single soul can escape on its solitary plank from the general wreck," such had been its final axiom. The 'Imitation of Christ' begins in self—terminates in self. The simple exemplary sentence, "He went about doing good," is wanting in the monastic gospel of this pious zealot. Of feeding the hungry, of clothing the naked, of visiting the prisoner, even of preaching, there is profound, total silence. The world is dead to the votary of the Imitation, and he is dead to the world, dead in a sense absolutely repudiated by the first vital principles of the Christian faith. Christianity, to be herself again, must not merely shake off indignantly the barbarism, the vices, but even the virtues of the Mediæval, of Monastic, of Latin Christianity.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LATIN POETRY. HISTORY.

WHAT did Latin Christianity add to the treasures of Latin poetry? Poetry, as in Greece, may have its distinct epochs in different forms, but it rarely, if ever, renews its youth.[a] Hardly more than half a century contains all that is of the highest order in Latin poetry—Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, the Elegiacs, Ovid. Even that noble, declamatory verse, which in the best passages of Lucan, in Juvenal, and even in Claudian (this, with the philosophic and didactic poetry, Lucretius, Virgil, and the exquisite poetry of common sense and common life in Horace, the only indigenous poetry of Rome), dies feebly out in the triumph of Christianity over Heathenism, as celebrated by Prudentius in his book against Symmachus.

Christian Latin Poetry. Paraphrases.

The three earlier forms of Christian Latin poetry were I. Paraphrases of the Scripture, II. Legends of Saints, and III. Hymns, with a few controversial poems, like that of S. Prosper on Pelagianism. 1. In the Scriptural Poems the life and energy of the biblical annalists or poets are beaten out to pleonastic and wearisome length; the antithetic or parallelistic form of the Hebrew poetry is entirely lost; the uncongenial Orientalism of thought and imagery will not submit to the hard involutions of the Latin: it dislocates the harmony of the verse, if verse still retains or strives after harmony, without giving its own rude strength or emphatic force. The Vulgate alone, by creating almost a new language, has naturalised the biblical

[a] It has done so besides Greece in England alone, hardly in Italy, unless Alfieri be admitted to make a third Epoch, with Dante and Petrarch, with Ariosto and Tasso. Spain has had but one, that of Lope, Cervantes and Calderon; Germany but one, and that a late one, of Schiller and Goethe. The most striking parallel is in India, of the vast Epics, the Mahabarata and Ramayana, of the Drama of Calidasa, of the Lyric Gita Govinda.

thoughts and figures, which obstinately refuse to be bound in the fetters of the Latin Hexameter. The infallible poetic sentiment of mankind will still refuse the name of poetry to the prolix, though occasionally vigorous, versifications of Fortunatus, Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator, Avitus, and the rest. As to the old voyager in the vast interminable ocean, if he beheld on some dreary mass of rock, a patch of brilliant green, a tuft of graceful trees, a cool rush of water, it became a paradise—a Tinian or a Juan Fernandez—and is described as one of the Elysian islands: so the curious reader, if, on traversing these endless poems, he discovers some lines more musical, some images more happily embodied in words, some finer or more tender thoughts expressed not without nature, he bursts out into rapture, and announces a deep mine of rich and forgotten poetry. The high-wrought expectations of the next visitants revenge their disappointment by exaggerating perhaps the dreariness and the barrenness.[b] In these poems creative power there is and can be none: invention had been a kind of sacrilege. The Hebrew poetry, in the coldest and most artificial translation, preserves something of its life and sententious vigour, its bold figures and imagery: in the many-folded shroud of the Latin poetic paraphrase it is a mummy.

The Epic Poetry of Latin Christianity (I feel the abuse of the words) had done its work of paraphrase, or had nearly exhausted itself in a few centuries; but if it sunk almost into silence from the fifth to the eighth, it rose again more ambitious, and seized the office of the historian, or that which had been the sole function of the humble orator under the later empire, that of the panegyrist. Hardly a great historic event took place, hardly a great

[b] Even M. Guizot, in his Lectures on Civilisation, cites passages from these authors, with praise, as it seems to me, far beyond their due. They are pre-Miltonic, as he asserts, in some of their thoughts, in some of their imagery, that is, they are drawn from the same sources; but what they want is, what Milton has given them; Poetry. So too M. Ampère in his valuable Lectures. The passage which I have quoted from Dracontius the Spaniard, in the History of Christianity (iii. p. 470), still appears to me the most favourable example which has occurred in the course of my reading: and I have toilsomely read much of that age. To me they are much inferior as Christian Latin Poetry to Sanazzaro or Vida, and to some of the Jesuits, who are at least correct, animated, harmonious.

man ascended a throne, or achieved fame, but some monkish versifier aspired to immortalise him with an interminable length of harsh hexameter, or of elegiac verse. Charlemagne indeed was mostly reserved for later romance, and happily had his historian Eginhard. But Louis the Pious was celebrated by Ermoldus Nigellus in a long poem in elegiac verse; the siege of Paris by the Normans was sung in hexameters by Abbo; the anonymous panegyrist endeavoured to raise the Italian Berengar into a hero; Hroswitha wrote of the deeds of the Emperor Otho; Gunther, the Ligurian, those of Barbarossa; Donizo, the Countess Matilda, from whom was inseparable the great name of Gregory VII. William the Apulian described the conquests of the Normans; William of Brittany, Philip Augustus; and so in unexhausted succession to the Cardinal Poet of Cœlestine V. and Boniface VIII. But from all those historical poems, who has yet struck out for our admiration one passage of genuine poetry? Perhaps their great merit is their want of poetry: they can lie under no suspicion of invention, hardly of poetic embellishment: they are simply verse chronicles, as veracious as the works of the contemporary prose historians of the cloister.

Later Latin poems.

Nor were these inexhaustible and indefatigable writers in Latin verse content with the domain of history, or the reward of the panegyrical orator. They seized and petrified, either for their amusement, or as a trial of skill, or for the solace and entertainment of their brother Monks, the old traditional German poetry, the fabulous histories, the initiatory romances, which, in their rude vernacular form and language, began to make themselves heard. What the Court or the Castle Hall listened to in the Lay or the Tale of the Wandering Minstrel, was heard in the Cloister in a Latin version. The Monks converted to their own use, perhaps supposed that they were saving from destruction, by transferring into imperishable Latin, the fleeting or expiring songs, which became the Niebelungen and the Heldenbuch. Such doubtless was the origin of the remarkable poem called Waltharius, or the Expedition of Attila, founded on the Legends of Dietrich, Siegfried, and Etzel.

But even in this very curious work, it is remarkable, that, although the innate poetry of the subject has given more than usual animation to the monkish versifier, yet the prosaic and historic element predominates. The cloister poet labours to make that history which is pure mythic romance; the wild song is hardening into a chronicle.[c] The epic of John of Exeter, on the War of Troy (as no doubt his lost Antiocheis), is, in verse, the romance history prevalent under the authority of Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius, during the middle ages.[d] With other Poems of that class, it mingles in discordant confusion the wild adventures of the romance writers, the long desultory tales and luxuriant descriptions of the Trouvères, with the classical form of verse. Throughout it is the Monk vainly labouring to be the bard; it is popular poetry cast in a form most remote from popularity, not only in a language, but in an artificial mould, which unfitted it for general acceptance. It was in truth the popular poetry of a small class, the more learned of the clergy and the Monk: the unlearned of that class must still have sought, and did seek, with the lay vulgar, their poetic enjoyment from the vernacular minstrel or Trouvère. Latinised it was, as they no doubt thought, chastened and elevated for their more pious and fastidious ears. Latin verse condescended to this humbler office, little suspecting that these popular songs contained elements of the true poetic spirit, which would throw all the Latin epics of the middle ages into irretrievable obscurity. Nothing indeed could escape these all-appropriating indefatigable versifiers of the cloister. Almost all the vernacular poetry of the middle ages has its Latin counter-type, poems of chivalry, poems of adventure, of course Saint-Legends, even the long fables, which the Germans call beast poetry, and the amatory songs. The Latin version of Reynard the Fox[e] has not been able, in the harsh and uncongenial

[c] De Expeditione Attilæ, edited by Fischer, Leipsic, 1780: and later by Grimm and Schmeller, Gottingen, 1838. Compare Gervinus, Geschichte der poetischen Nat. Lit. der Deutschen, i. p. 99 *et seqq.*

[d] Warton, in his History of English Poetry, gives some spirited verses from John of Exeter. The poem may be read (it is hard reading) subjoined to the edition of Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius. Amsterdam, 1702.

[e] Renardus Vulpes. Editio Princeps. Edited by M. Mone. Stuttgard et Tubingæ, 1832.

form of Monkish elegiac verse, altogether to quench the drollery of the original. It is written by a man with a singular mastery over the barbarous but expressive Latin of his day, of extraordinary ingenuity in finding apt and fitting phrases for all the strange notions and combinations in this bestial allegory. But "Renardus Vulpes" is manifestly of a late period; it is a bitter satire on Monks and Monkery. The Wolf Isengrim is an Abbot: it contains passages violently and coarsely Anti-papal.[f] It belongs, the Latin version at least, rather perhaps to the class of satiric than of epic Latin poetry.

On the whole, this vast mass of Latin poetry offers no one exception to the eternal irrepealable law, that no great poet is inspired but in his native language. The Crusades were, perhaps happily, too late even to tempt the ambition of the Cloister-poets. By that time, the art of Latin versification, if not lost, was not so common: the innate poetry of the subject breaks occasionally through the barbarous but spirited prose of William of Tyre and James de Vitry.

Lives of the Saints.

II. The poems on the Lives of the Saints, it might have been supposed, as treading on subjects in which the mythic and imaginative element of Christianity predominated, would at least display more freedom and originality. They were addressed to the higher emotions, which poetry delights to waken, wonder, sympathy, veneration, pity; they were legends in which noble men and beautiful women, Saints and Holy Virgins, were at issue with power, with cruelty, with fate. The new poetic machinery of Angels and Devils was at the command of the poet; the excited faith of the hearers was ready to accept fiction for truth; to believe the creation of the poet with unsuspecting belief. But legend only reluctantly and ungraciously submitted to the fetters of Latin verse; the artificial form seemed to dull the inspiration. Even in the earliest period, the Saint-Poems and the Martyrdoms (except perhaps some pleasing descriptions

[f] This alone would confute (if confutation were necessary) the theory of the editor M. Mone, who attributes the aim of the Satire to certain obscure personages in an obscure but early period in the history of Flemish Gaul. Note, p. 1, et seqq. The Flemish origin of the poem seems now proved, but the original was clearly Teutonic, not Latin.

in Paulinus of Nola) are, in my judgement, far inferior, even in poetic merit, to the prose legends. I know nothing equal to the Martyrs of Vienne, or the Perpetua and Felicitas, even in the best of Prudentius, who is in general insufferably long, and suffocates all which is noble or touching (and there is much of both) with his fatal copiousness. In later times the lives of St. Boniface, St. Gall, and St. Anschar have more of the imaginative tone of poetry than the hard harsh verses of the period. I should almost say that the Golden Legend awakens more of the emotion of poetry than any of the poetic lives of the mediæval Saints.

III. Even in the Hymnology[g] of the Latin Church, her lyric poetry, it is remarkable, that, with the exception of the Te Deum, those hymns, which have struck, as it were, and cloven to the universal heart of Christendom, are mostly of a late period. The stanzas which the Latin Church has handed down in her services from Prudentius are but the flowers gathered from a wilderness of weeds.[h] The "Pange Lingua Gloriosi" is attributed to Venantius Fortunatus, or Mamertus Claudianus, in the fifth century; the "Stabat Mater" and the "Dies Iræ" are, the first probably by Jacopone da Todi, and the last by Thomas di Celano, in the fourteenth.[i] These two, the one by its tenderness, the other by its rude grandeur, stand unrivalled; in melody, perhaps the hymn of St. Bonaventura to the Cross approaches nearest to their excellencies.[j] As a whole, the Hymnology of the Latin Church has a singu-

[g] Compare Thesaurus Hymnologicus. H. A. Daniel. Hales, 1841. A copious and excellent collection.

[h] The two or three stanzas, 'Salvete Flores Martyrum,' are from the middle of a long, it must be confessed tiresome Poem. Cathem. xii. v. 125. Prudentius, even in Germany, was the great popular author of the Middle Ages; no work but the Bible appears with so many glosses (interpretations or notes) in high German, which show that it was a book of popular instruction. Rodolf Raumer, Einwirkung Christenthums auf die Althoch Deutsche Sprache, p. 222.—Seine Hymnen und die des Ambrosius, bilden mit den übrigen Christlichen Lyrikern, das Gesangbuch des mittelalterlichen Klerus.—The hymns of Ambrose were translated into German in the ninth century.

[i] The two former are too well known to extract. Take two stanzas of the latter:—

"Recordare sanctæ crucis,
Qui perfectam viam ducis,
Delectare jugiter,
Sanctæ crucis recordare,
Et in ipsâ meditare
Insatiabiliter.

"Quum quiescas aut laboras,
Quando rides, quando plorus,
Dolcs sive gaudeas,
Quando vadis, quando venis,
In solatiis in pœnis
Crucem corde teneas."
—Apud Daniel, ii. p. 102.

Of the more general hymns I would select that for the Evening, the 'Deus Creator Omnium,' for its gentle cadence

larly solemn and majestic tone. Much of it, no doubt, like the lyric verse of the Greeks, was twin-born with the music; it is incessantly wedded with the music; its cadence is musical rather than metrical. It suggests, as it were, the grave full tones of the chant, the sustained grandeur, the glorious burst, the tender fall, the mysterious dying away of the organ. It must be heard, not read. Decompose it into its elements, coldly examine its thoughts, its images, its words, its versification, and its magic is gone. Listen to it, or even read it with the imagination or the memory, full of the accompanying chant, it has an unfelt and indescribable sympathy with the religious emotions, even of those of whose daily service it does not constitute a part. Its profound religiousness has a charm to foreign ears, wherever there is no stern or passionate resistance to its power. In fact, all Hymnology, vernacular as well as Latin, is poetry only to predisposed or habituated ears. Of all the lyric verse on the noblest, it might be supposed the most poetic subject, how few hymns take their place in the poetry of any language.

But out of the Hymnology, out of the Ritual, of which the hymns were a considerable part, arose that which was the initiatory, if rude, form of religious tragedy. The Christian Church made some bold advance to be the theatre as well as the temple of the people. But it had an intuitive perception of the danger; its success appalled its religious sensitiveness. The hymn which, like the Bacchic

(p. 17); the Paschal Hymn of the Roman Breviary (usually the best), p. 83; In Exequiis Defunctorum (p. 137):—

"Jam mœsta quiesce querela,
Lacrimas suspendite matres;
Nullus sua pignora plangat,
Mors hæc reparatio vitæ est.
Quidnam tibi saxa cavata,
Quid pulcra volunt monumenta
Res quod nisi creditur illis,
Non mortua, sed data somno."

Or, the two attributed to St. Bernard, p. 227 and 432, which show the height of his mysticism. Of what are called the Rhythms, by far the finest is that on Paradise, attributed, no doubt without ground, to St. Augustine. It was never chanted in the Church;—

"Ad perennis vitæ fontem mens sitivit arida,
Claustra carnis præsto frangi clausa quærit anima:
Gliscit, ambit, eluctatur exul frui patria?
Dum pressuris et ærumnis se gemit obnoxiam,
Quam amisit, dum deliquit, contemplatur gloriam,
Præsens malum auget boni perditi memoriam.
Nam quis promat summæ pacis quanta sit lætitia,
Ubi vivis margaritis surgunt ædificia,
Auro celsa micant tecta, radiant triclinia:
Solis gemmis pretiosis hæc structura nectitur,
Auro mundo, tanquam vitro, urbis via sternitur,
Abest limus, deest limus, lues nulla cernitur.
Hiems horrens, æstas torrens illic nunquam sæviunt,
Flos perpetuus rosarum ver agit perpetuum,
Candent lilia, rubescit crocus, sudat balsamum.
Virent prata, vernant sata, rivi mellis confluunt,
Pigmentorum spirat odor, liquor et aromatum,
Pendent poma floridorum nec lapsura nemorum.
Non alternat luna vices, sol vel cursus siderum,
Agnus est felicis orbis lumen inocciduum,
Nox et tempus desunt ei, diem fert continuum."—Daniel, i. p. 116; and in works of St. Augustine.

There are thirteen more stanzas.

song of the Greeks, might seem developing into scenic action, and becoming a drama, shrank back into its simpler and more lonely grandeur. The Ritual was content to worship, to teach the facts of the Scripture history only by the Biblical descriptions, and its significant symbolic ceremonial. Yet the Latin Mysteries, no doubt because they were Latin, maintained in general their grave and serious character. It was when, to increase its power and popularity, the Mystery spoke in the vulgar tongue, that it became vulgar;[k] then buffoonery, at first perhaps from rude simplicity, afterwards from coarse and unrestrained fun, mingled with the sacred subjects. That which ought to have been the highest, noblest tragedy, became tragi-comedy, and was gradually driven out by indignant and insulted religion.

In its origin, no doubt the Mystery was purely and essentially religious. What more natural than to attempt, especially as the Latin became more unfamiliar to the common ear, the representation rather than the description of the striking or the awful scenes of the Gospel history, or those in the lives of the Saints; to address the quick, awakened and enthralled eye, rather than the dull and palled ear.[m] There was already on the walls, in the chapels, in the cloisters, the painting representing the history, not in words, but in act; by gesture, not by speech. What a theatre! Such religious uses could not desecrate buildings so profoundly hallowed; the buildings would rather hallow the spectacle. That theatre was the Church, soaring to its majestic height, receding to its interminable length, broken by its stately divisions, with its countless chapels, and its long cloister, with its succession of concentric arches. What space for endless variety, if not for change of scene! How effective the light and shade, even by daylight; how much more so heightened by the command of an infinity of lamps, torches, tapers, now pouring their full effulgence on one majestic object, now

[k] See in Warton (the passage is worth reading) the dull buffoonery introduced into the Mystery on the Murder of the Innocents, performed by the English at the Council of Constance. This, however, must have been in Latin, but probably from an English original.—vol. ii. p. 75.

[m] "Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus."
A. P. l. 180.

showing rather than enlightening the deep gloom! How grand the music, either pervading the whole space with its rolling volumes of sound, or accompanying some solemn or tender monologue! If it may be said without offence, the company was already enrolled, to a certain degree practised, in the dramatic art; they were used to enforce their words by significant gesture, by movement, by dress. That which was considered the great leap in the Greek drama, the introduction of the second actor, was already done: different parts of the service were assigned to priest, or humbler deacon. The antiphonal chant was the choir breaking into two responsive parts, into dialogue. There were those who recited the principal parts; and, besides them the choir of men or of boys, in the convent, of females and young girls; acolyths, mutes without number. Take, as an illustration of the effect of these dramas in their simple form, the Massacre of the Innocents.[n] It opens with a procession of Innocents, doubtless children in white robes, who march in long lines, rejoicing, through the long cloister of the Monastery, chanting, "How glorious is Thy Kingdom! Send down, O God, Thy Lamb." The Lamb immediately appears; a man, with a banner, bearing the Lamb, takes his place at their head, leading them up and down, in long gleaming procession. Herod (doubtless clad in all the splendour of barbaric and Oriental attire) is seated on his throne. A squire appears, hands him his sceptre, chanting, "On the throne of David." In the meantime, an Angel alights upon the manger, singing, "Joseph, Joseph, Joseph, thou son of David;" and reciting the verse of the Gospel commanding the flight into Egypt, "Weep not, O Egypt." His armour-bearer informs Herod of the departure of the Wise Men: he bursts out into wrath. While he is raging, the children are still following the steps of the Lamb, and sweetly chanting.[o] Herod delivers the fatal sword to his armour-bearer. The Lamb is silently withdrawn; the children remain, in their

[n] Published by Mr. Wright—Early Mysteries. London, 1838. Several Latin Mysteries have been published in Paris, but only a small number of copies by Bibliographical Societies, and so not of general access. But in truth the Poem, the Mystery itself forms a very subordinate part of these representations.

[o] Agno qui sancto pro nobis mortificato,
Splendorem patris, splendorem virginitatis,
Offerimus Christo, sub signo numinis isto.

fearless innocence, singing, "Hail, Lamb of God! O hail!" The mothers entreat mercy. An Angel descends while the slain children are dying, while they lie dead: "Ye who dwell in the dust, awake and cry aloud!" The Innocents answer: "Why, O God, dost thou not defend us from bloodshed?" The Angel chants: "Wait but a little time till your number is full." Then enters Rachel, with two women comforting her: their musical dialogue is simple, wild, pathetic.[p] As they lead off the sad mother, an Angel, hovering above, sings the antiphone, "Suffer little children to come unto me." At the voice of the Angel all the children enter the choir, and take up their triumphant song. Herod disappears; Archelaus is on his throne. The Angel summons Joseph and the Virgin from Egypt. Joseph breaks out into a hymn to the Virgin. The cantor of the Church intones the Te Deum; the whole Church rings with the august harmony.

I have chosen this brief and simple episode, as it were, in the Gospel, to show in what spirit, with what aim, and doubtless with what wonderful effect, these sacred representations were introduced in the Middle Ages. But there was no event, however solemn and appalling, up to the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, which was not in like manner wrought into action, preached in this impressive manner to awe-struck crowds. Legend, like the Gospels, lent itself to the same purpose: instead of being read, it was thrown into a stirring representation, and so offered to spectators as well as to hearers. When all were believers, for those who had not the belief of faith and love, had that of awe and fear, these spectacles no doubt tended

[p] After her first lament they reply:—

"Noli, Virgo Rachel, noli, dulcissima mater,
Pro nece parvorum fletus retinere dolorum.
Si quæ tristaris exulta quæ lacrimaris,
Namque tui nati vivunt super astra beati."

Rachel dolens—

"Heu! heu! heu!
Quomodo gaudebo, dum mortua membra videbo!
Dum sic commota fuero per viscera tota!
Me faciunt verè pueri sine fine dolere!
O dolor, o patrum mutataque gaudia matrûm!
Ad lugubres luctus lacrimarum fundite fluctus,
Judeæ florens patriæ lacrimando dolorem."

After some more verses the consolations end:

"Numquid flendus est iste
Qui regnum possidet cœleste!
Quique prece frequento
Miseris fratribus
Apud Deum auxiliatur."

Was Rachel represented by a male or a female? A Nun deploring the loss of her children had been somewhat incongruous: Did the Monks and Nuns ever join their companies? In one stage direction it appears the women were personated by men. "Primum procedunt tres fratres præparati et vestiti in similitudinem trium Mariarum."—Mysterium Resurrectionis, quoted by M. Onésime de Roy, Mystères, p. 4.

"Gaude, gaude, gaude—
Maria Virgo, *cunctas hæreses*," &c.

most powerfully to kindle and keep alive the religious interest; to stamp upon the hearts and souls of men the sublime truths, as well as the pious fictions of religion. What remains, the dry skeleton of these Latin mysteries, can give no notion of what they were when alive; when alive, with all their august, impressive, enthralling accessories, and their simple, unreasoning, but profoundly-agitated hearers. The higher truths, as well as the more hallowed events of our religion, have in our days retired into the reverential depths of men's hearts and souls: they are to be awfully spoken, not, what would now be thought too familiarly, brought before our eyes. Christian tragedy, therefore, could only exist in this early initiatory form. The older Sacred history might endure to be poeticised in a dramatic form, as in the 'Samson Agonistes;' it might even, under certain circumstances, submit to public representation, as in the Esther, and Athalie, of Racine, and the Saule of Alfieri. A martyrdom like that of Polyeucte might furnish noble situations. But the history of the Redeemer, the events on which are founded the solemn mysteries of our religion, must be realised only, as it were, behind the veil; they will endure no alteration, no amplification, not the slightest change of form or word: with them as with the future world, all is an object of "faith, not of sight."

The abbess of a German convent made a more extraordinary attempt to compel the dramatic art into the service of Latin Christianity. The motive of Hroswitha, declared by herself, is not less strange than her design.[q] It was to wean the age (as far as we can judge, the age included the female sex—it included nuns, even the nuns of her own rigid order) from the fatal admiration of the licentious comedy of Rome.[r] "There are persons," writes the saintly recluse, "who prefer the vanity of heathen books to the Sacred Scriptures, and beguiled by the charms of the language, are constantly reading the dangerous fictions of Terence, and defile their souls with the knowledge of wicked actions." There is a simplicity almost incredible,

[q] These plays have been recently dited, and translated into French with reat care by M. Magnin.—Théâtre de Hroswitha. Paris, 1843.

[r] Hroswitha wrote also a long poem in hexameters, Panegyris Oddonum,

but, from its incredibility, showing its perfect simplicity, in Hroswitha's description not only of her motives but of her difficulties. The holy poetess blushes to think that she too must dwell on the detestable madness of unlawful love, and the fatally tender conversations of lovers. If however she had listened to the voice of modesty, she could not have shown the triumph of divine Grace, as of course Grace in every case obtains its signal triumph. Each of the comedies, instead of its usual close, a marriage, ends with the virgin or the penitent taking the vow of holy celibacy. But in the slender plot the future saints are exposed to trials which it must have been difficult to represent, even to describe, with common decency. Two relate to adventures, in which holy hermits set forth in the disguise of amorous youths, to reclaim fallen damsels, literally from the life of a brothel, and bear them off in triumph, but not without resistance, from their sinful calling. Of course the penitents become the holiest of nuns. And the curious part of the whole seems to be that these plays on such much more than dubious subjects should not only have been written by a pious abbess, but were acted in the convent, possibly in the chapel of the convent. This is manifest from the stage directions, the reference to stage machinery, the appearance and disappearance of the actors. And nuns, perhaps young nuns, had to personate females whose lives and experiences were certainly most remote from convent discipline.[8] The plays are written in prose, probably because in those days the verse of Terence was thought to be prose: they are slight, but not without elegance of style, derived, it should seem, from the study of that perilously popular author, whom they were intended to supersede. There are some strange patches of scholastic pedantry, a long scene on the theory of music, another on the mystery of numbers, with some touches of buffoonery, strange enough, if acted by nuns before nuns, more strange if acted by others, or before a less select audience, in a convent. A wicked heathen, who is rushing to commit

[8] See note of M. Magnin (p. 457), in answer to Price, the editor of Warton, ii. 28. M. Magnin has studied with great industry the origin of the Theatre in Europe.

violence on some Christian virgins, is, like Ajax, judicially blinded, sets to kissing the pots and pans, and comes out with his face begrimed with black, no doubt to the infinite merriment of all present. The theatre of Hroswitha is indeed a most curious monument of the times.

No wonder that the severer Churchmen took alarm, and that Popes and Councils denounced these theatric performances, which, if they began in reverent sanctity, soon got beyond the bounds not merely of reverence, but of decency. But, like other abuses, the reiteration of the prohibition shows the inveterate obstinacy and the perpetual renewal of the forbidden practice.[t] The rapid and general growth of the vernacular Mysteries, rather than the inhibition of Pope and Council, drove out the graver and more serious Latin Mysteries, not merely in Teutonic countries—in England and Germany—but in France, perhaps in Italy.[u]

Latin, still to a certain extent the vernacular language of the Church and of the cloister, did not confine itself to the grave epic, the hymn, or the Mystery which sprang out of the hymn. The cloisters had their poetry, disguised in Latin to the common ear, and often needing that disguise. Among the most curious, original, and lively of the monkish Latin poems, are those least in harmony with their cold ascetic discipline. Anacreontics and satires sound strangely, though intermingled with moral poems of the same cast, among the disciples of S. Benedict, S. Bernard, and S. Francis. If the cloister had its chronicle and its hymn-books, it often had its more profane song-book, and the songs which caught the ear seem to have

[t] The prohibitions show that the ancient use of masks was continued:—"Interdum ludi fiunt in ecclesiis theatrales, et non solum ad ludibriorum spectacula introducuntur in eis monstra larvarum, verùm etiam in aliquibus festivitatibus diaconi, presbyteri ac subdiaconi insaniæ suæ ludibria exercere præsumunt, mandamus, quatenus ne per hujusmodi turpitudinem ecclesiæ inquinetur honestas, prælibatam ludibriorum consuetudinem, vel potius corruptelam curetis a vestris ecclesiis extirpare."—Decret. Greg. Boehmer, Corpus Juris Canon. t. ii. fol. 418.—"Item, non permittant sacerdotes ludos theatrales fieri in ecclesiâ et alios ludos inhonestos."—Conc. Trev. A.D. 1227. Hartzheim, iii. p. 529. Compare Synod Dioc. Worm. A.D. 1316. Ibid. iv. p. 258.

[u] Mary Magdalen was a favourite character in these dramas. Her earlier life was by no means disguised or softened. See the curious extract from a play partly Latin, partly German, published by Dr. Hoffman, Fundgruben für Geschichte Deutschen Sprache, quoted by Mr. Wright. Preface to 'Early Mysteries.' London, 1838.

been propagated from convent to convent.[x] The well-known convivial song, attributed to Walter de Mapes, was no doubt written in England: it is read in the collection of a Bavarian convent.[y] These, and still more, the same satires, are found in every part of Latin Christendom; they rise up in the most unexpected quarters, usually in a kind of ballad metre, to which Latin lends itself with a grotesque incongruity, sometimes with Leonine, sometimes with more accurate rhyme. The Anacreontic Winebibber's song, too well known to be quoted at length, by no means stands alone: the more joyous monks had other Bacchanalian ditties, not without fancy and gay harmony.[z]

The Anacreons of the cloister did not sing only of wine: they were not silent on that subject, least appropriate, but seemingly not least congenial, to men under the duty, if not under the vow, of perpetual chastity. From the variety and number of these poems, which appear scattered about as freely and carelessly as the moral poems and satires, it might seem that there was a constant interchange between the troubadour or the minnesinger and the ecclesiastic or the monk. Many of the amatory Latin poems are apparently versions, many the originals of those sung by the popular poets in the vulgar tongue; and there can be no doubt about the authorship of most of the Latin poems. They were the growth as they were the amusement of the

[x] Among the collections which I have read or consulted on this prolific subject are the old one, of Flaccius Illyricus.—Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems, by Thomas Wright. London, 1838.—Lateinische Gedichte des X und XI. J. H. von Grimm und And. Schmeller. Gottingen, 1838.—Poésies Populaires Latines du Moyen Age. Edelstan du Meril. Paris, 1847.—Popular Songs—Poems of Walter de Mapes. Camden Society by Thos. Wright.

[y] This Collection, the 'Carmina Benedicto Burana' (one of the most curious publications of the Stuttgard Union), the Latin Book of Ballads it may be called of the Convent of Benedict Buren, contains many love-verses, certainly of no ascetic tendency; and this, among many other of the coarser monkish satires.

[z] "Mihi est propositum in tabernâ mori,
Vinum sit appositum morientis ori,
Et dicant cum venerint Angelorum chori,
Deus sit propitius huic potatori.

"Ave! color vini clari,
Dulcis potus non amari,
Tua nos inebriari
Digneris potentiâ.
O quam felix creatura,
Quam produxit vitis pura,
Omnis mensa sit secura
In tuâ præsentiâ."

O! quam placens in colore!
O! quam fragrans in odore!
O! quam sapidum in ore!
Dulce linguæ vinculum!
Felix venter quem entrabis!
Felix guttur quod rigabis!
Felix os quod tu lavabis!
Et beata labia!

Ergo vinum collaudemus!
Potatores exultemus!
Non potantes confundamus
In æterna supplicia!"
—Wright, p. 120.

cloister. They were written for the monks and clergy, to whom alone they were intelligible. It may suffice in a grave history (which, however, as endeavouring to reveal the whole character of past times, cannot altogether decline such topics) to select one of the most curious, certainly the most graceful, of the poems of this class, in its language at least, if not altogether in its moral, inoffensive. It is a kind of Eclogue, in which two fair damsels, Phyllis and Flora, one enamoured of a Knight, the other of a Clerk, contend for the superior merit of their respective lovers, and submit their cause to the decision of the old heathen god, Cupid. The time of this Idyl is a beautiful noon in spring, its scene a flowery meadow, under the cool shade of a pine by a murmuring stream.[a] The fair champion of the knight taunts the indolence, the luxuriousness, the black dress and shaven crown of the clerk: she dwells on the valour, noble person, bravery, and glory of the knight. The champion of the clerk, on his wealth, superior dignity, even his learning. His tonsure is his crown of dominion over mankind; he is the sovereign of men: the knight is his vassal.[b] After some dispute, they mount, one a fine mule, the other a stately palfrey, and set off, both splendidly accoutred, to the Court of the God of Love. The Paradise of Cupid is described rapidly, but luxuriantly, with much elegance, and a profusion of classical lore. Silenus is not forgotten. The award is in favour of the clerk; an award which designates him

[a] It is in the Carmina Benedicto Burana, pp. 155:—

6.
Susurrabat modicum
Ventus tempestivus,
locus erat viridi
gramine festivus,
et in ipso gramine
defluebat rivus,
brevis atque garrulo
Murmure lascivus.

7.
Ut puellis noceat
Calor solis minus
fuit juxta rivulum
Spatiosa pinus
venustata foliis,
late pandens sinus,
nec entrare poterat
calor peregrinus.

8.
Consedere virgines
Herba sedem dedit,
Phillis propè rivulum,
Flora longè sedet,
Et dum sedet utraque
ac in sese redit,
amor corda vulnerat
et utramque lædit.

9.
Amor est interius
latens et occultus,
et corde certissimos
elicit singultus,
pallor genas inficit,
alterantur vultus,
sed in verecundiâ
furor est sepultus.

[b] I omit other objections of Phyllis to a clerical lover. This is the worst she can say:—

29.
Orbem cum lætificat
hora lucis festæ
tunc apparet clericus
satis inhoneste
in tonsurâ capitis
et in atrâ veste
portans testimonium
voluntatis mœstæ.

To this Flora rejoins:—

37.
Non dicas opprobrium
Si cognoscas morem,
vestem nigram clerici
comam breviorem;
habet ista clericus
ad summum honorem,
ut sese significet
omnibus majorem.

38.
Universa clerico
Constat esse prona,
et signum imperii
portat in coronâ,
imperat militibus,
et largitur dona,
famulante major est
imperans persona,

39.
otiosum clericum
semper esse juras,
viles spernit operas
fateor et duras,
sed cum ejus animus
Evolat ad curas,
cœli vias dividit
et rerum naturas.

40.
Meus est in purpurâ,
tuus in loricâ;
tuus est in prœlio
meus in lecticâ,
ubi facta principum
recolit antiqua,
scribit, quærit, cogitat—
totum de amicâ.

as fitter for love: and this award is to be valid to all future times.[c] Few will question whence came this poem: that any layman should be so studious, even in irony, of clerical interests, can scarcely be suspected. If the ballad poetry of a people, or of a time, be the best illustration of their history, this poem, without doubt, is significant enough.

It were unjust not to add that there is a great mass of this rhyme, not less widely dispersed, of much more grave and religious import—poems which embody the truths and precepts of the faith, earnest admonitions on the duties of the clergy, serious expostulations on the sufferings and oppressions of the poor, moral reflections on the times. The monkish poets more especially dwelt on the Crusades. Though there was no great poem on the subject, there were songs of triumph at every success—at every disaster a wild poetic wail.[d] The Crusade was perpetually preached in verse, half hymn, half war-song.[e]

Yet, after all, the strength of these Monk-Poets was in satire. They have more of Juvenal, if not of his majestic march and censorial severity, of his pitilessness, of his bitterness, it may be said of his truculency, than of Catullus, Terence, or Horace. The invectives against Rome, against her pride, avarice, venality—against Popes and Cardinals—against the Hierarchy, its pomp, its luxury—against the warlike habits of the Prelates, the neglect of their holy duties—even against the Monks, put to the test their rude nerve and vigour; and these poems in the same or in similar strain turn up out of the convent libraries in many parts of Germany, in France, in England, in every country beyond the Alps (Italy mostly expressed her Antipapal passions in

[c] The close is delightfully naive. I must only subjoin the award:—

78.	79.
Fiunt et justitiæ	*ad amorem clericum*
ventilant vigorem	dicunt *aptiorem.*
ventilant et retrahunt	Comprobavit curia,
Curiæ rigorem	dictionem juris,
secundum scientiam	et teneri voluit
et secundum morem,	etiam futuris.

This poem is also in Mr. Wright's English collection, who has subjoined a translation of the time of Queen Elizabeth, with very many of the beauties, some of the faults of that age.

[d] Carmina Benedicto-Burana, xxii. to xxviii.:—

Agedum Christicola,
surge vide
Ne de fide
reputeris frivola,
suda martyr in agone,
spe mercedis et coronæ,
derelictâ Babylone
pugna
pro cœlesti regione
et ad vitam te compone
Pugnâ.

[e] See xxvi. on the conquests of Saladin; and in Edelstan du Meril's Collection—Lætare Hierusalem.

other ways). They are of all ages; they have the merit that they are the outpourings of overburthened hearts, and are not the frigid and artificial works of mechanics in Latin verse; they are genial even in their ribaldry; they are written by men in earnest, bitterly deploring or mercilessly scourging the abuses of the Church. Whether from righteous indignation or malignity, from moral earnestness or jealousy and hatred of authority, whether its inspiration was holy and generous or sordid and coarse, or, as in most human things, from mingling and contradictory passions, the monkish Latin satire maintained its unretracted protest against the Church. The Satirists impersonated a kind of bold reckless antagonist against Rome and the hierarchy,[f] confounding together in their Golias, as Rabelais in later days, solemnity and buffoonery, pedantic learning and vulgar humour, a profound respect for sacred things and freedom of invective against sacred persons. The Goliards became a kind of monkish rhapsodists, the companions and rivals of the Jongleurs (the reciters of the merry and licentious fabliaux); Goliardery was a recognised kind of mediæval poetry. Golias has his Metamorphoses, his Apocalypse, his terrible Preachment, his Confession,[g] his Complaint to the Pope, his Address to the Roman Court, to the impious Prelates, to the Priests of Christ, to the Prelates of France; and, finally, a Satire on women, that is, against taking a wife, instinct with true monastic rigour and coarseness. Towards the Pope himself—though Golias scruples not to arraign his avarice, to treat his Bulls with scorn—there is yet some awe.[h] I doubt if the Roman Pontiff was yet to the fiercest

[f] Mr. Wright has abundantly proved this in his preface to the Poems of Walter de Mapes (Introd. p. ix, &c.). He is equally successful, according to my judgement, in depriving of the glory, or relieving from the reproach, of these compositions the celebrated Walter de Mapes. De Mapes had a feud with the Cistercians or White Monks, and did not spare his enemies; but he was not Golias. Under that name ranked bards of a considerable period, and in my opinion of more than one country. Mr. Wright is not so satisfactory in claiming them all for England: one poem seems to show itself written in Pavia. Compare the copy of the Confession in Wright (p. 71), and the Carmina Benedicto Burana (p. 57).

[g] The Confession contains the famous drinking song. The close is entirely different, and shows the sort of common property in the poems. Both poems mention Pavia. Yet the English copy names the Bishop of Coventry, the German "the Elect of Cologne," as Diocesan.

[h] I have already quoted the lines in one of those songs in which he derives the word Papa, by apocope, from pagare, "pay, pay." In his complaint

of these poets, as to the Albigensians and to the Spiritual Franciscans, Antichrist. The Cardinals meet with less respect; that excessive and proverbial venality, which we have heard denounced century after century, is confirmed, if it needed confirmation, by these unsparing satirists.[i]

The Bishops are still arraigned for their martial habits,[k] their neglect of their sacred functions, their pride, their venality, their tyranny. Some were married: this and universal concubinage is the burthen of the complaint against the Clergy.[m] The Satirists are stern monks to

to the Pope, Golias is a poor clerical scholar poet:

Turpe tibi, pastor bone,
Si divina lectione
Sprotâ fiam laicus,
Vel absolvo clericatu,
Vel fac ut in cleri statu
Perseverem clericus.
Dulcis erit mihi status,
Si prebenda muneratus
Redditu vel alio,
Vivam licet non habunde,
Saltem mihi detur unde,
Studeam de proprio.

From a very different author in a different tone is the following:—

1.
Dic Xti veritas,
Dic cara raritas,
Dic rara charitas,
Ubi nunc habitas?
Aut in valle Visionis,
Aut in throno Pharaonis,
Aut in alto cum Nerone,
Aut in antro cum Timone.
Vel in viscolla scirpea
Cum Moyse plorante,
Vel in domo Romulea
Cum bullâ fulminante.

2.
Bulla fulminante
Sub judice tonante,
Reo appellante,
Sententia gravante,
Veritas apprimitur,
Distrahitur et venditur.
Justitia prostante,
Itur et recurritur
Ad curiam, nec ante
Quis quid consequatur
Donec exuitur
Ultimo quadrante.

3.
Respondit Caritas
Homo quid dubitas,
Quid me sollicitas?
Non sum quod usitas,
Nec in curo, nec in austro,
Nec in foro, nec in claustro,
Nec in bysso, nec in cuculla,
Nec in bello, nec in bulla.
De Jericho sum veniens,
Ploro cum sauciato
Quem duplex Levi transiens
Non astitit grabato.
Carmina Benedicto Burana, p. 51.

One of these stanzas is contained in a long poem made up very uncritically from a number of small poems (in Flaccius Illyricus, p. 29, &c.) on Papal absolution and indulgences:—

Nos peccata relaxamus
Absolutos collocamus
Sedibus ethereis;
Nos habemus nostras leges,
Alligantes omnes reges
In manicis aureis.
Carm., B. B., p. 17.

[i] See the Poem de Ruinâ Romæ. Wright, p. 217. Carmina B. B. 16:—

3.
Vidi vidi caput mundi
instar maris et profundi
Vorax guttur Siculi;
ibi mundi bithalassus,
ibi sorbet aurum Crassus
et argentum sæculi.
* * *
ibi pugna galearum
et concursus piratarum
id est cardinalium
* * *
25.
Cardinales ut prædixi,
Novo jure Crucifixi
Vendunt patrimonium,
Petrus foris, intus Nero,
intus lupa, foris verò
sicut agni ovium.

This is but a sample of these Poems.

[k] Episcopi cornuti
Conticuere muti,
ad prædam sunt parati
et indecenter coronati
pro virgâ ferunt lanceam,
pro infulâ galeam,
clipeum pro stolâ,
(hæc mortis erit mola)
loricam pro albâ,
hæc occasio calva,
pollem pro humerali,
pro ritu seculari.
Sicut fortes incedunt,
et a Deo discedunt, &c.
Carm., B. Burana, p. 15. Compare Wright, Sermo Goliæ ad Prælatos, p. 48.

[m] Nec tu participes
Conjugio vitæ vitio
Namque multos invenio
qui sunt hujus participes,
ecclesiarum principes.

others, however their amatory poetry may tell against themselves.[n] The Archdeacons' Court is a grievance which seems to have risen to a great height in England. Henry II. we have heard bitterly complaining against its abuses: it levied enormous sums on the vices of the people, which it did not restrain.[o] All are bitterly reproached with the sale of the services of the Church, even of the Sacraments.[p] The monks do not escape; but it seems rather a quarrel of different Orders than a general denunciation of all.

The terrible preachment of Golias on the Last Judgement ought not to be passed by. The rude doggrel rises almost to sublimity as it summons all alike before the Judge, clerk as well as layman; and sternly cuts off all reply, all legal quibble, all appeal to the throne of St. Peter. The rich will find no favour before Him who is the Judge, the Author of the sentence, the Witness. God the Judge will judge Judges, he will judge Kings; be he Bishop or Cardinal, the sinner will be plunged into the stench of hell. There will be no fee for Bull or Notary, no bribe to Chamberlain or Porter. Prelates will be delivered up to the most savage tormentors; their life will be eternal death.[q]

O sacerdos hæc responde,
qui frequenter et joconde
cum uxore dormis, unde
Mane surgens, missam dicis,
corpus Christi benedicis,
post amplexus meretricis,
minus quam tu peccatricis.
* * * *
Miror ego, miror plane
quod sub illo latet pane
Corpus Christi, quod prophane
Tractat manus illa mane,
Miror, nisi tu mireris,
quod a terrâ non sorberis,
cumque sæpe prohiberis
iterare non vereris.
Wright, pp. 49, 50.

[o] Compare in Wright the three curious poems, De Concubinis Sacerdotum, Consultatio Sacerdotum, Convocatio Sacerdotum, pp. 171, 174, 180.

Ecce capitulum legi de moribus
Archdiaconi, qui suis vicibus
quicquid a præsulis evadit manibus
Capit et lacerat rostris et unguibus.
Hic plenus oculis sedet ad synodum,
Lynx ad insidias, Janus ad commodum,
Argus ad animi scelus omnimodum,
Et Polyphemus est ad artis metodum.
Doctorum statuit decreta millium,
Quorum est pondus supra jus jurium,
Unum qui solverit, reus est omnium,
Nisi resolverit prius marsupium

* * * *
Ecclesiastica jura venalia,
facit propatulo, sed venialia
cum venum dederit, vocat a veniâ
quam non inveniens venit Ecclesia.
—Wright, p. 9.

[p] Jacet ordo clericalis
in respectu laicalis,
spina Christi fit mercalis
generosa generalis
Veneunt altaria,
venit eucharistia,
cum sit nugatoria
gratia venalis.
—Carmin. B. Burana, p. 41.

This and the following poems dwell on simony of all kinds. See the Poem De Grisis Monachis, Wright, p. 54. De Clarevallensibus et Cluniacensibus, ib. p. 237. De Malis Monachorum, 187.

[q] Quid dicturi miseri sumus ante thronum,
Ante tantum judicem, ante summum bonum;
Tunc non erit aliquis locus hic præconum,
Cum nostrarum præmia reddet actionum.
Cum perventum fuerit examen veri,
Ante thronum stabimus judicis severi,
Nec erit distinctio laici vel cleri.
Nulla nos exceptio poterit tueri.
Hic non erit licitum quicquam allegare,
Neque jus rejicere, neque replicare,
Nec ad Apostolicam sedem appellare,
Reus tunc damnabitur, nec dicetur quare.

Cogitate

History throughout these centuries bore on its face that it was the work not of the statesman or the warrior, unless of the Crusader, or of the warrior Bishop, it was that of the Monk. It is universally Latin during the earlier period: at first indeed in Italy, in Latin which may seem breaking down into an initiatory Romance or Italian. Erchempert and the Salernitan Chronicle, and some others of that period, are barbarous beyond later barbarism. When history became almost the exclusive property of the Monks, it was written in their Latin, which at least was a kind of Latin. Most of the earlier Chronicles were intended each to be a universal history for the instruction of the brotherhood. Hence monkish historians rarely begin lower than the Creation or the Deluge. According to the erudition of the writer, the historian is more or less diffuse on the pre-Christian History, and that of the Cæsars. As the writers approach their own age, the brief Chronicle expands and registers at first all that relates to the institution and interests of the monastery, its founders and benefactors, their lives and miracles, and condescends to admit the affairs of the times in due subordination. But there is still something of the legend. Gradually, however, the actual world widens before the eyes of the monkish historian; present events in which he, his monastery, at all events the Church, are mingled, assume their proper magnitude. The universal-history preface is sometimes actually discarded, or shrinks into a narrower compass. He is still a chronicler; he still, as it were, surveys everything from within his convent-walls, but the world has entered within his convent. The Monk has become a Churchman, or the Churchman, retired into the monastery, become almost an historian. The high name of Historian, indeed, cannot be claimed for any mediæval Latin writer; but as chroniclers of their own times (their value is entirely confined to their own times; on the past they are merely servile copyists of the same traditions) they are invalu-

Latin history.

Cogitate divites qui vel quales estis,
Quod in hoc judicio facere potestis;
Tunc non erit aliquis locus hic Digestis,
Idem erit Deus hic judex, autor, testis.
Judicabit judices judex generalis,
Nihil ibi proderit dignitas regalis;
Sed fœtorem sentiet pœnæ gehennalis,
Sive sit Episcopus, sive Cardinalis.
Nihil ibi dabitur bullæ vel scriptori,
Nihil camerario, nihil janitori;
Sed dabuntur præsules pessimo tortori,
Quibus erit vivere sine fine mori.
—Wright, p. 53.

able.[r] Their very faults are their merits. They are full of, and therefore represent the passions, the opinions, the prejudices, the partialities, the animosities of their days. Every kingdom, every city in Italy, in Germany every province, has its chronicler.[s] In England, though the residence of the chronicler, the order to which he belongs, and the office which he occupies, are usually manifest, it is more often the affairs of the realm which occupy the annals. France, or rather the Franco-Teutonic Empire, began with better promise; Eginhard has received his due praise; the Biographers of Louis the Pious, Thegan, and the Astronomer, may be read with pleasure as with instruction: Nithard falls off. In England Matthew Paris, or rather perhaps Roger of Wendover, takes a wider range: he travels beyond the limits of England; he almost aspires to be a chronicler of Christendom. The histories of the Crusades are lively, picturesque, according as they come directly from the Crusaders themselves. Perhaps the most elaborate, William of Tyre, being a compilation, is least valuable and least effective. Lambert of Hertzfield (vulgarly of Aschaffenburg) in my judgement occupies, if not the first, nearly the first place, in mediæval history. He has risen at least towards the grandeur of his subject. Our own chroniclers, Westminster, Knighton, and Walsingham, may vie with the best of other countries. As to their Latinity, Saxo Grammaticus, the Sicilian Ugo Falcandus, command a nobler and purer style.

Yet after all the Chronicle must, to attain its perfection, speak in the fresh picturesqueness, the freedom, and the energy of the new vernacular languages. The Latin, though in such universal use, is a foreign, a conventional tongue even among Churchmen and in the monastery. Statesmen, men of business, men of war, must begin to relate the affairs of States, the adventures and events of war. For the perfect Chronicle we must await Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart. Villani is more than a chronicler; he is approaching to the historian.

[r] *E.g.* in the Saxon Chronicle.

[s] To characterise the Chronicles, even those of the different nations, would be an endless labour.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN LETTERS IN THE NEW LANGUAGES OF EUROPE.

CHRISTIANITY, indeed, must await, and not in history alone, the creation, growth, perfection of new languages, before she can become the parent of genuine Christian letters and arts—of letters and arts which will maintain permanent influence and ascendancy over the mind of man. But the abrogation of the Latin as the exclusive language of Christian letters and arts must be inevitably and eventually the doom of Latin Christianity. Latin must recede more and more into a learned language understood by the few. It may linger in the religious service of all who adhere to the Church of Rome, not absolutely unintelligible to those whose language is of Latin descent, and among them with a kind of mysterious and venerable indistinctness not unfavourable to religious awe. The Latin is a congenial part of that imposing ritual system which speaks by symbolic gestures and genuflexions, by dress, by music, by skilful interchange of light and darkness, by all which elevates, soothes, rules the mind through the outward senses. A too familiar Liturgy and Hymnology might disturb this vague, unreasoning reverence. With the coarsest and most vulgar Priesthood these services cannot become altogether vulgar; and except to the strongest or most practical minds, the clear and the definite are often fatal to the faith. Yet for popular instruction either from the Pulpit or through the Printing Press, Christianity must descend, as it does descend, to the popular language. In this respect Latin has long discharged its mission—it is antiquated and obsolete.

But while the modern languages of Europe survive; and we can hardly doubt the vitality of French, Spanish, German, and our own English (now the vernacular tongue of North America and Australia, that too of government

and of commerce in vast regions of Africa and Asia), the great Christian writers, Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Calderon; Pascal, Bossuet, and the pulpit orators of France, with Corneille and Racine; the German Bible of Luther, the English Bible, Shakspeare, Milton, Schiller, some of our great divines, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, will only die with the languages in which they wrote. Descartes, Bacon, Locke, Reid, Kant, will not share the fate of the scholastic philosophers, till the French, English and German are to new races of men what mediæval Latin is to us. And religion must speak to mankind in the dominant languages of mankind.

It might seem indeed that in the earliest Latin as distinguished from the Teutonic languages, the Romance in its various forms, Sicilian, Italian, Catalan, Provençal, poetry, the primal form of vernacular literature was disposed to break loose from Latin Christianity, from hierarchical unity, even from religion. The Clergy in general remained secluded or shrunk back into the learned Latin; the popular poetry, even the popular prose, became profane, unreligious, at length in some parts irreligious. The Clergy, as has been seen, for their own use and amusement, transmuted much of the popular poetry into Latin, but it ceased thereby to be popular except among themselves. They shut themselves up from the awakening and stirring world in their sanctity, their authority, their learning, their wealth. The Jongleurs, the Trouvères, the Troubadours, became in a certain sense the popular teachers; the Bards and the sacerdotal order became separate, hostile to each other. The Clergy might seem almost content with the intellect of man; they left the imagination, except so far as it was kept enthralled by the religious ceremonial, to others. Perhaps the Mysteries, even the early Latin Mysteries, chiefly arose out of the consciousness of this loss of influence; it was a strong effort to recover that which was gliding from their grasp. Some priests were Troubadours, not much to the elevation of their priestly character; Troubadours became priests, but it was by the renunciation of their poetic fame; and by setting themselves as far asunder as possible from their

former brethren. Fulk of Marseilles[a] became the furious persecutor of those who had listened with rapture to his poetry. Later one of the most famous of the schoolmen was said to have been a Troubadour.[b]

Chivalry alone, so far as chivalry was Christian, held poetry to the service of Christianity, and even of the Church; but this was chiefly among the Trouvères of Southern France or the Langue d'Oil. The Provençal poetry of the South, the cradle of modern song, contains some noble bursts of the Crusading religious sentiment; it is Christian, if chivalry be Christian, in tone and thought. But, in general, in the castle courts of the Provençal Princes and Nobles poetry not only set itself above Christian religion, but above Christian morals. The highest Idealism was amatory Platonism, which while it professed religious adoration of woman, degraded her by that adoration. It may be doubted whether it could ever have broken forth from that effeminacy to which it had condemned itself. Grace, perhaps tenderness, was its highest aim; and Poetry soars not above its aim. But this subject has already found its place in our history. In its lower and popular form Provençal poetry, not less immoral, was even more directly anti-hierarchical. It was not heretical, for it had not religion enough to be heretical: religion was left to the heretic. The Fabliau, the Satire, the Tale, or the Song, were the broad and reckless expression of that aversion and contempt into which the Clergy of Southern France had fallen, and tended immeasurably to deepen that aversion and contempt. But it has been sadly shown how the Albigensian war crushed the insurrection of Provençal poetry against Latin letters, together with the insurrection against the Latin hierarchy. The earliest vernacular poetry perished

[a] For the history of Fulk of Marseilles, whose poetic fame endured to the days of Dante, see vol. iv. p. 197.

[b] No less a person than William Durand, the great general of the Pope, the great Ecclesiastical Legist, almost the last great Schoolman, the author of the Speculum and the Rationale, is traditionally reported to have been a Troubadour. A tale is told of him very similar to that of Romeo and Juliet. Conceive Romeo growing up into a High Churchman and a Schoolman!—Ritter, Christliche Philosophie, vii. p. 19. The question is examined with fairness and sagacity in the xxth vol. of the Hist. Lit. de la France. p. 435.

almost without heirs to its fame; its language, which once divided France, sunk into a provincial dialect.[c]

Christendom owes to Dante the creation of Italian Poetry, though Italian, of Christian Poetry. It required all the courage, firmness, and prophetic sagacity of Dante to throw aside the inflexible bondage of the established hierarchical Latin of Europe. He had almost yielded and had actually commenced the Divine Comedy in the ancient, it seemed, the universal and eternal language.[d] But the Poet had profoundly meditated, and deliberately resolved on his appeal to the Italian mind and heart. Yet even then he had to choose, to a certain extent to form, the pure, vigorous, picturesque, harmonious Italian which was to be intelligible, which was to become native and popular to the universal ear of Italy. He had to create; out of a chaos he had to summon light.[e] Every kingdom, every province, every district, almost every city, had its dialect, peculiar, separate, distinct, rude in construction, harsh, in different degrees, in utterance. Dante in his book on Vulgar Eloquence ranges over the whole land,[f] rapidly discusses the Sicilian and Apulian,

[c] Even in our days Provence has a poet, and that of no undeserved fame, Jasmine: of course, the language has undergone much change.

[d] Compare among other authorities the valuable essay of Perticari, the son-in-law of Monti (in Monti, Proposta di alcune Correzioni, &c. al Vocab. della Crusca, v. ii. pte ii.). Perticari quotes the very curious letter of the Monk Ilario to Uguccione della Faggiuola. To this Monk the wandering Dante showed part of his great work. The Monk was astounded to see that it was written in the vulgar tongue. "Io mi stupiva ch' egli avesse cantato in quella lingua, perchè parea cosa difficile, anzi da non credere, chè quegli altissimi intendimenti si potessero significare par parole di vulgo; ne mi parea convenire chè una tanta e si degna scienza fosse vestita a quel modo si plebeo." Dante replied, that so he himself had originally thought. He had once begun his poem in Latin, and these were the lines—

"Ultima regna canam, fluido contermina mundo,
Spiritibus quæ lata patent, quæ præmia solvunt
Pro meritis cuicunque suis."

But he had thrown aside that lyre, "ed un altra ne, temperai conveniente all' orecchio de' moderni." The Monk concludes "molte altre cose con sublimi affetti soggiunse" (p. 328). Perticari quotes another remonstrance addressed to the poet by Giovanni di Virgilio da Cesena, closing with these words: "Se te giova la fama, non sii contento a si brevi confini, nè all' esser fatto glorioso dal vil giudicio del volgo" (p. 330). Conceive the Divine Comedy stranded, with Petrarch's Africa, high on the barren and unapproachable shore of ecclesiastical Latin.

[e] "Poscia nel libro ch' ei nomina del Vulgare Eloquenza, cominciò ad illustrare l' idioma poetico ch' egli *creava*." See the excellent observations on writing in a dead language, Foscolo, Discorso sul Testo di Dante, p. 250.

[f] I can have no doubt whatever of the authenticity of the de Vulgari Eloquentiâ; contested because Dante threw aside the vulgar Tuscan or Florentine as disdainfully as the rest, and even preferred the Bolognese. To a stranger it is extraordinary that such an Essay as that of Perticari should be necessary to vindicate Dante from the charge of ingratitude and want of patriotism, even of hatred of Florence (Florence which had

the Roman and Spoletan, the Tuscan and Genoese, the Romagnole and the Lombard, the Trevisan and Venetian, the Istrian and Friulian; all are coarse, harsh, mutilated, defective. The least bad is the vulgar Bolognese. But high above all this discord he seems to discern, and to receive into his prophetic ears a noble and pure language, common to all, peculiar to none, a language which he describes as Illustrious, Cardinal, Courtly, if we may use our phrase, Parliamentary, that is, of the palace, the courts of justice, and of public affairs.[g] No doubt it sprung, though its affiliation is by no means clear, out of the universal degenerate Latin, the rustic tongue, common not in Italy alone, but in all the provinces of the Roman Empire.[h] Its first domicile was the splendid Sicilian and Apulian Court of Frederick II., and of his accomplished son. It has been boldly said, that it was part of Frederick's magnificent design of universal empire: he would make Italy one realm, under one king, and speaking one language.[i] Dante does homage to the noble character of Frederick II.[k]

exiled him), because Florentine vanity was wounded by what they conceived injustice to pure Tuscan. See also the Preface to the de Vulgari Eloquio in the excellent edition of the Opera Minora by Fraticelli. Florence, 1833.

[g] Itaque adepti quod quærebamus, dicimus, Illustre, Cardinale, Aulicum et Curiale Vulgare in Latio, quod omnis Latiæ civitatis est et nullius esse videtur, et quo municipia Vulgaria omnia Latinorum mensurantur, ponderantur et comparantur.—Lib. i. cxvi.

[h] Perticari has some ingenious observations on the German conquests, and the formation of Italian from the Latin. The German war-terms were alone admitted into the language. But his theory of the origin of the Romance out of the ecclesiastical Latin, and still more his notion that the ecclesiastical Latin was old lingua rustica, rest on two bold and unproved assumptions, though doubtless there is some truth in both: "La fina industria degli Ecclesiastici, che in Romano spiegando la dottrina Evangelica, ed in Romano scrivendo i fatti della chiesa cattolica, facevano del Romano il linguaggio pontifical e Cattolica cioè *universale*. Ma quella non era più il Latino illustre; non l' usato da Lucrezio e da Tullio, non l' udito nel Senato e nella Corte di Cesare; era quel *rustico* che parlava l' intero volgo dell' Europa Latina" (p. 92). Still I know no treatise on the origin of the Italian language more full, more suggestive, or more valuable than Perticari's.

[i] "Federigo II. esperava a riunire l' Italia sotto un solo principe, una sola forma di governo, e una sola lingua."—Foscolo sulla lingua Italiana, p. 159. This essay, printed (1850) in the fourth volume of my poor friend's Works, has only just reached me.

[k] Quicquid poetantur Itali Sicilianum vocatur .... Sed hæc fama Trinacriæ terræ, si recte signum ad quod tendit inspiciamus, videtur tantum in opprobrium Italorum Principum remansisse qui non heroico more, sed plebeo sequuntur superbiam. Siquidem illustres heroes Fredericus Cæsar, et bene genitus ejus Manfredus nobilitatem ac rectitudinem suæ formæ pandentes, donec fortuna permansit, humana secuti sunt, brutalia dedignantur, propter quod corde nobiles atque gratiarum dotati inhærere tantorum principum majestati conati sunt: ita quod eorum tempore quicquid excellentes Latinorum nitebantur, primitus in tantorum Cŏronatorum aulâ pro-

Sicily is the birthplace of Italian Poetry. The Sicilian Poems live to bear witness to the truth of Dante's assertion, which might rest on his irrefragable authority alone. The Poems, one even earlier than the Court of Frederick,[m] those of Frederick himself, of Pietro della Vigna,[n] of King Enzio, of King Manfred, with some peculiarities in the formation, orthography, use and sound of words, are intelligible from one end of the Peninsula to the other.[o] The language was echoed and perpetuated, or rather resounded spontaneously, among poets in other districts. This courtly, aristocratical, universal Italian Dante heard as the conventional dialect in the Courts of the Cæsars,[p] in the republics, in the principalities throughout Italy.[q] Perhaps Dante, the Italian, the Ghibelline, the assertor of the universal temporal monarchy, dwelt not less fondly in his imagination on this universal and noble Italian language, because it would supersede the Papal and hierarchical Latin; the Latin with the Pope him-

dibat. Et quia regale solum erat Sicilia, factum est quicquid nostri prædecessores vulgariter protulerunt, Sicilianum vocatur. Quod quidem retinemus et nos, nec posteri nostri permutare valebunt, Racha! Racha! Quid nunc personat tuba novissimi Frederici? quid tintinnabulum II. Caroli? quid cornua Johannis et Azzonis Marchionum potentum? quid aliorum Magnatum tibiæ? nisi Venite carnifices! Venite altriplices! Venite avaritiæ sectatores. Sed præstat ad propositum repedare quam frustra loqui.—De Vulgar. Eloquio, i. xii. p. 46. There is a splendid translation of this passage in Dantesque Italian by Foscolo, Discorso, p. 255.

[m] See the Rosa fresca olentissima, Foscolo, della Lingua, p. 150.

[n] Cosi ne' versi seguenti non v' e un unico sgrammaticamento de sintassi, nè un modo d'esprimersi inelegante, nè un solo vocabolo che possa parere troppo antico.

"Non dico che alla vostra gran bellezza
Orgoglio non convegna e stiale bene,
Che a bella donna orgoglio ben convene,
Che la mantene—in pregio ed in grandezza:
Troppo alterezza—e quella che sconvene.
Di grande orgoglio mai bel non avvene."
Poeti del 1mo Sec. i. p. 195.
See Foscolo, p. 166.

Peter della Vigna (Peter de Vinca) did not write Sicilian from want of command of Latin: his letters, including many of the State Papers of his master Frederick II., are of a much higher Latinity than most of his time.

[o] See the passages from Frederick II. and King Enzio, Foscolo, p. 165.

[p] See, among other instances, the pure Italian quoted from Angelati by Pericari, written at Milan the year before the birth of Dante. Perticari's graceful essay, as far as the earlier Italian poetry may be compared with that of Foscolo, sulla Lingua; the other poets Cino da Pistoia, the Guidos (Foscolo ranks Guido Cavalcanti, Dante's best friend, very high) may be read in a collection printed at Florence, referred to in a former volume. Nor must the prose be forgotten; the history of Matteo Spinelli is good universal Italian. The maritime code of Amalfi has been recently discovered, in Italian perfectly intelligible in the present day. I owe this information to my accomplished friend Signr. Lacaita.

[q] La lingua ch' el nomina cortegiana, e della quale ei disputa tuttavia, la sua fortuna vedevola nascere ed ampliarsi per la perpetua residenza de' Cesari in Roma, e frà le republiche e le tirannidi, tutte confuse in un sol reame. Di questo ci ti pare certissimo come di legge preordinata della Providenza e connessa al sistema del' Universo.—Compare quotations, Foscolo, Discorso, p. 254.

self, would withdraw into the sanctuary, into the service of the Church, into affairs purely spiritual.

However this might be, to this vehicle of his noble thoughts Dante fearlessly entrusted his poetic immortality, which no poet anticipated with more confident security. While the scholar Petrarch condescended to the vulgar tongue in his amatory poems, which he had still a lurking fear might be but ephemeral, in his Africa and in his Latin verses he laid up, as he fondly thought, an imperishable treasure of fame.[r] Even Boccaccio, happily for his own glory, followed the example of Dante, as he too probably supposed in his least enduring work, his gay Decamerone. Yet Boccaccio doubted, towards the close of his life, whether the Divine Comedy had not been more sublime, and therefore destined to a more secure eternity in Latin.[s]

Thus in Italy, with the Italian language, of which, if he was not absolutely the creator, he was the first who gave it permanent and vital being, arose one of the great poets of the world. There is a great chasm between the close of Roman and the dawn of Italian letters, between the period at which appeared the last creative work written by transcendent human genius in the Roman language, while yet in its consummate strength and perfection, and the first, in which Italian Poetry and the Italian tongue came forth in their majesty; between the history of Tacitus and the Divina Comedia. No one can appreciate more highly than myself (if I may venture to speak of myself), the great works of ecclesiastical Latin, the Vulgate, parts of the Ritual, St. Augustine: yet who can deny that there is barbarism, a yet unreconciled confusion of uncongenial elements, of

[r] Compare Petrarch's letter (Epist. Fam. xi. 12), in which he haughtily vindicates himself from all jealousy of Dante. How should he, who is the companion of Virgil and Homer, be jealous of one who enjoys the hoarse applause of taverns and markets. I may add that Mr. Bruce Whyte, in his curious volumes, Histoire des Langues Romanes, has given a careful analysis of Petrarch's "Africa," which he has actually read, and discovered some passages of real merit (vol. iii. ch. xl.).

[s] "Non dico peró che se in versi Latini fosse (non mutato il peso delle parole vulgari) ch' egli non fosse molto più artificioso e più sublime: perciochè molto più arte e nel parlare latino chè nel moderno."—Boccac. Comm. Div. Com. f. f. As if sublimity in poetry consisted in skilful triumph over difficulty. But on the old age of Boccaccio, see Foscolo, p. 213.

Orientalism and Occidentalism, in the language. From the time of Trajan, except Claudian, Latin letters are almost exclusively Christian; and Christian letters are Latin, as it were, in a secondary and degenerate form. The new era opens with Dante.

Tacitus and Dante.

To my mind there is a singular kindred and similitude between the last great Latin, and the first great Italian writer, though one is a poet, the other an historian. Tacitus and Dante have the same penetrative truth of observation as to man and the external world of man; the same power of expressing that truth. They have the common gift of flashing a whole train of thought, a vast range of images on the mind by a few brief and pregnant words; the same faculty of giving life to human emotions by natural images, of imparting to natural images, as it were, human life and human sympathies: each has the intuitive judgement of saying just enough; the stern self-restraint which will not say more than enough; the rare talent of compressing a mass of profound thought into an apophthegm; each paints with words, with the fewest possible vords, yet the picture lives and speaks. Each has that relentless moral indignation, that awful power of satire which in the historian condemns to an immortality of earthly infamy, in the Christian Poet aggravates that gloomy immortality of this world by ratifying it in the next. Each might seem to embody remorse.[t] Patrician, high, imperial, princely, Papal criminals are compelled to acknowledge the justice of their doom. Each, too, writing, one of times just passed, of which the influences were strongly felt in the social state and fortunes of Rome: the other of his own, in which he had been actively concerned, throws a personal passion (Dante of course the most) into his judgements and his language, which, whatever may be its effect on their justice, adds wonderfully to their force and reality. Each, too, has a lofty sympathy with good, only that the highest ideal of Tacitus is a death-defying Stoic, or an all-accomplished Roman Proconsul, an Helvidius Thrasea, or an Agricola; that of Dante a suffering, and so purified and

[t] It is a saying attributed to Talleyrand of Tacitus, "Quand on lit cet homme-là on est au Confessional."

beatified Christian saint, or martyr; in Tacitus it is a majestic and virtuous Roman matron, an Agrippina, in Dante an unreal mysterious Beatrice.

Dante is not merely the religious Poet of Latin or mediæval Christianity; in him that mediæval Christianity is summed up as it were, and embodied for perpetuity. The Divine Comedy contains in its sublimest form the whole mythology, and at the same time the quintessence, the living substance, the ultimate conclusions of the Scholastic Theology. The whole course of Legend, the Dæmonology, Angelology, the extra mundane world, which in the popular belief was vague, fragmentary, incoherent, in Dante, as we have seen, becomes an actual, visible, harmonious system. In Dante heathen images, heathen mythology are blended in the same living reality with those of Latin Christianity, but they are real in the sense of the early Christian Fathers. They are acknowledged as part of the vast hostile Dæmon world, just as the Angelic Orders, which from Jewish or Oriental tradition obtained their first organisation in the hierarchy of the Areopagite. So, too, the schools of Theology meet in the Poet. Aquinas, it has been said, has nothing more subtle and metaphysical than the Paradise, only that in Dante single lines, or pregnant stanzas, have the full meaning of pages or chapters of divinity. But though his doctrine is that of Aquinas, Dante has all the fervour and passion of the Mystics; he is Bonaventura as well as St. Thomas.

Dante was in all respects but one, his Ghibellinism, the religious poet of his age, and to many minds not less religious for that exception. He was anti-Papal, but with the fullest reverence for the spiritual supremacy of the successor of St. Peter. To him, as to most religious Imperialists or Ghibellines, to some of the spiritual Franciscans, to a vast host of believers throughout Christendom, the Pope was two distinct personages. One, the temporal, they scrupled not to condemn with the fiercest reprobation, to hate with the bitterest cordiality: Dante damns Pontiffs without fear or remorse. But, the other, the Spiritual Pope, was worthy of all awe or reverence, his sacred person must be inviolate; his words, if

Dante's Ghibellinism.

not infallible, must be heard with the profoundest respect; he is the Vicar of Christ, the representative of God upon earth. With his Ghibelline brethren Dante closed his eyes against the incongruity, the inevitable incongruity, of these two discordant personages meeting in one: the same Boniface is in hell, yet was of such acknowledged sanctity on earth that it was spiritual treason to touch his awful person. The Saints of Dante are the Saints of the Church; on the highest height of wisdom is St. Thomas, on the highest height of holiness, St. Benedict, St. Dominic, St. Francis. To the religious adversaries of the Church he has all the stern remorselessness of an inquisitor. The noble Frederick II., whom we have just heard described as the parent of Italian poetry, the model of a mighty Emperor, the Cæsar of Cæsars, is in hell as an arch-heretic, as an atheist.[u] In hell, in the same dreary circle, up to his waist in fire, is the noblest of the Ghibellines, Farinata degli Uberti. In hell for the same sin is the father of his dearest friend and brother poet Guido Cavalcanti. Whatever latent sympathy seems to transpire for Fra Dolcino, he is unrelentingly thrust down to the companionship of Mohammed. The Catholic may not reverse the sentence of the Church.

Petrarch. Petrarch, as an Italian poet, excepting in his Ode to the Virgin, stands almost aloof from the mediæval religion; it is only as a Latin poet, and in his familiar Letters, that he inveighs against the vices, the irreligion of the Court of Avignon.

Boccaccio. Boccaccio, the third of this acknowledged Triumvirate, was, on the other hand, in his one great work, unquestionably as regards the dominant religion of his times, its monkhood and hierarchism, the most irreligious, on account of his gross immoralities, to all ages an irreligious writer. The Decamerone centres in itself all the wit, all the indecency, all the cleverest mockery of the French and Provençal Fabliaux, and this it has clothed in that exquisite, all admired Florentine which has secured its undying fame. The awful description of the Plague in

[u] Inferno, x. 1119. Piero della Vigna calls him—

"Il mio Signor, che fu d'amor si degno."—*Inferno*, xiii. 75.

Florence has been compared, but by no means with justice, to that of Thucydides and that of Lucretius. This grave opening of the Decamerone might be expected to usher in a book of the profoundest devotion, the most severe, ascetic penitential. After this, another Dante might summon the smitten city to behold its retributive doom in the Infernal Regions; a premature Savanarola might thunder his denunciations, and call on Florence, thus manifestly under divine visitation, to cast all her pomps and vanities, her ornaments, her instruments of luxury, upon the funeral pyre; to sit and lament in dust and ashes. This terrific opening leads, but not in bitter irony, to that other common consequence of such dark visitations, the most reckless licence. Tale follows tale, gradually sinking from indecency into obscenity, from mockery to utter profaneness. The popular religion, the popular teachers, are exposed with the coarsest, most reckless pleasantry. Erasmus, two centuries later, does not scoff with more playful freedom at pilgrimages, reliques, miracles: Voltaire himself, still two centuries after Erasmus, hardly strips their sanctity from monks, nuns and friars, with more unsparing wit. Nothing, however sung or told in satiric verse or prose against the Court of Rome, can equal the exquisite malice of the story of the Jew converted to Christianity by a visit to Rome, because no religion less than divine could have triumphed over the enormous wickedness of its chief teachers, the Cardinals, and the Pope. Strange age of which the grave Dante and the gay Boccaccio are the representatives! in which the author of the Decamerone is the biographer of Dante, the commentator on the Divine Comedy, expounding, pointing, echoing, as it were, in the streets of Florence the solemn denunciations of the poet. More strange, if possible, the history of the Decamerone. Boccaccio himself bitterly repented of his own work: he solemnly warned the youth of Florence against his own loose and profane novels; the scoffer at fictitious reliques became the laborious collector of reliques not less doubtful; the scourge of the friars died in the arms of friars, bequeathing to them his manuscripts, hoping only for salvation through

their prayers.[x] Yet the disowned and proscribed Decamerone became the text-book of pure Italian. Florence, the capital of letters, insisted on the indefeasible prerogative of the Florentine dialect, and the Decamerone was ruled to be the one example of Florentine. The Church was embarrassed; in vain the Decamerone was corrected, mutilated, interpolated, and indecencies, profanenesses annulled, erased: all was without effect; the Decamerone must not be degraded from its high and exemplary authority. The purity of morals might suffer, the purity of the language must remain unattainted; till at length an edition was published in which the abbesses and nuns, who were enamoured of their gardeners, became profane matrons and damsels; friars, who wrought false miracles, necromancers; adulterous priests, soldiers. But this last bold effort of jesuitical ingenuity was without effect: the Decamerone was too strong for the censure in all its forms; it shook off its fetters, obstinately refused to be altered, as before it had refused to be chastened; and remains to this day at once the cleverest and bitterest satire, and the most curious illustration of the religion of the age.[y]

[x] See in the works of Petrarch the very curious letter to Boccaccio, de Vaticinio Morientium, Opera, p. 740. Boccaccio had written in a paroxysm of superstitious terror to Petrarch concerning the prophecies of a certain holy man, Peter of Sienna, on the death of the two poets. Petrarch evidently does not believe a word of what had frightened poor Boccaccio. He alleges many causes of suspicion. "Non extenuo vaticinii pondus, quicquid a Christo dicitur verum est. Fieri nequit ut veritas mentiatur. At id quæritur Christianæ rei hujus autor sit, an alter quispiam ad commenti fidem, quod sæpe vidimus, Christi nomen assumpserit." The poet urges Boccaccio, at great length, not to abandon letters, but only the lighter letters of his youth.

[y] "Finalmente un Dominicano Italiano e di natura più facile (chiamavasi Eustachio Locatelli, e morì vescovo a Reggio) vi s' interpose e per essere stato confessore de Pio V., impetrò di Gregorio XIII. che il Decamerone non fosse mutilato, se non in quanto bisognova il buono nome degli Ecclesiastici."—P. 249. The account of the whole transaction at length may be read in the Discorso prefixed to Foscolo's edition of the Decamerone, London, 1825. Compare the fifth and sixth discourse of Foscolo; the most just criticism with which I am acquainted on Boccaccio, his merits, his influence, his style, and his language. I quote Boccaccio's will on Foscolo's authority. There is nothing new under the sun, nothing obsolete. I possess a translation of Eugene Sue's Wandering Jew, printed on the coarsest paper, the rudest type, and cheapest form, obviously intended for the lower Roman Catholics, in which the Jesuit becomes a Russian spy; all that is religious is transformed into political satire.

CHAPTER VI.

LANGUAGE OF FRANCE.

NOTHING is more remarkable in the civil or in the religious history of the West, nothing led to more momentous or enduring results, than the secession, as it were, of the great kingdom of France from the Teutonic, and its adhesion to the Latin division of Christendom; the fidelity of its language to its Roman descent, and its repudiation of the German conqueror. For about four centuries, loosely speaking, Gaul, from the days of Julius Cæsar, was a province of the Roman Empire. During that period it became Romanised in manners, institutions, language. The Celtic dialect was driven up into the North-Western corner of the land. If it subsisted, as seems to have been the case in the time of Irenæus, still later in that of Jerome, or in the fifth century,[a] as the dialect of some of the peasantry; if it left its vestiges in the names of plains, of forests and mountains; if even some sounds and words found their way into the supervening Latin, and became a feeble constituent of French; yet there can be no doubt that the great mass of the French language, both the Langue d'Oil of the North, and the Langue d'Oc of the South, is of Latin origin.[b] France.

[a] According to Ulpian in the second century wills might be drawn in Latin or in the language of Gaul, the Celtic therefore had a legal existence. St. Jerome in the fourth century compares the language of the Asiatic Galatians with that which he had heard spoken in the neighbourhood of Treves. In the fifth, Sulpicius Severus desires one of the interlocutors in a dialogue to speak in Gallic or Celtic (Dialog. i. *sub fine*). Sidonius Apollinarius says that the nobles of his province (Auvergne) had only just cast off all the scales of their Celtic speech: this may have been the pronunciation. The father of Ausonius, a physician at Bazas in Aquitaine, spoke Latin imperfectly. Compare Ampère, Hist. Lit. de la France, pp. 36 and 136.

[b] M. Fauriel (Histoire de la Poésie Provençale, i. p. 195) observes of the Provençal that there are more words not of Latin origin than is commonly supposed. He had collected 3000. The whole Provençal literature might perhaps furnish him as many. A great part he could trace to no known language. Some few are Arabic, many Greek, some Celtic, some Basque; not above fifteen Teutonic. The whole investigation is worthy of study.

For about four centuries, Teutonic tribes, Goths, Burgundians, Alemannians, Franks, ruled in Gaul, from the first inroad and settlement of the Visigoths in the South, down to the third generation after Charlemagne. Clovis and his race, Charlemagne and his immediate descendants, were Teutons; the language at the Court of Soissons, in the capitals of Neustria and Austrasia, as afterwards in that of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, was German. Nor was it only so in the Court; there were Germans throughout the Frankish realm of Charlemagne. The Council of Tours enacts that every Bishop should have homilies in both languages; he should be able to expound them in the rustic Roman and in the Teutonic, so as to be intelligible to the whole people.[c]

Separation. A.D. 842.

But the grandsons of Charlemagne behold Latin and Teutonic nationality, the Latin and Teutonic language, dividing the Western Empire. The German is withdrawing, if not beyond the Rhine, to the provinces bordering on the Rhine; Latin is resuming its full dominion over France and the French language. At Strasburg, only thirty years after the Council of Tours, France has become French, Germany German. The two Kings of the same race, equally near in blood to Charlemagne, take their oaths in languages not only dialectically different, but distinct in root and origin. Germany still recedes, leaving but few traces of its long dominion; the Celtic element probably contributes more to the French language than the German. In truth the Germans after all were but an armed oligarchy in France, like the Turks in their European provinces, but by no means so inaccessibly shut up in their Oriental habits, in their manners, in their religion. Even in the Visigothic South, no sooner had the conquest passed over, than the native language, or rather the naturalised Latin, reasserted its independence, its jealous and exclusive superiority: and this, although the Goths were routed and driven out by another Teutonic race, the Franks of the North. France returned entirely to its

[c] A.D. 812. Labbe, Concil. vii. 1263. This injunction was renewed at Rheims and at Mentz A.D. 847. There are fragments of old German sermons.—Raumer, p. 66.

Latinity; and from its rustic Roman gradually formed that language which was to have such wide influence on later civilisation.

In this conservation of France to Latin and Latin Christianity, no doubt Latin Christianity, and the hierarchy so long, even under the German sway, of Latin descent, powerfully contributed. The unity of religion in some degree broke down the barrier between the Teuton and the Roman Gaul; they worshipped the same God in the same Church; looked for absolution from their sins, trembled before, or sought humbly the counsel of the same Priest. But the Clergy, as has been seen, remained long almost exclusively Roman. The Teutons, who aspired to the high places of the Church (for the services at least remained obstinately Roman), were compelled to possess one qualification, the power of ministering in that Latin service. The most rude, most ignorant, most worldly Bishop or Priest must learn something, and that lesson must be the recitation at least, or pronunciation of Latin. Charlemagne's schools, wherever the Teutonic element was the feeblest, would teach in the Rustic Roman, or the Roman more or less rapidly tending to its new form. At least in the Church and in the Cloister the Latin ruled without rival; among the people the Latin element was far the stronger: the stronger is ever aggressive; and the Teutonic was by degrees renounced, and driven towards the Rhine, or over the Rhine. The German Teuton, mindful of his descent, might still call himself a Frank, but the Gallic Frank had ceased to be a German.[d]

The Normans.

It is not the least singular fact in the history of the French language, that another German, or kindred Scandinavian race, wrests a large province from France. Normandy takes its name from its Norman conquerors; the land, according to Teutonic usage, is partitioned among those adventurers; they are the lords of the

[d] In the epitaph on Gregory V. (997), he is said to have spoken three languages; Frankish (German), the Vulgar (Romance or Italian), and Latin:—

"Usus Francisca, vulgari, et voce Latinâ
Instituit populos eloquio triplici."

Gregory (Bruno, cousin of the Emperor Otho) was a German.—Murator. Diss. ii. 91. At this time in Italy traces begin to appear of Italian in wills and deeds. Ibid. p. 93.

soil. In an exceedingly short time the Normans cease to be Teutons; they are French or Latin in language. About a century and a half after the establishment of the Nor-
A.D. 912-1065. mans in France, the descendants of Rollo conquer England, and the Conqueror introduces not a kindred dialect, but the hostile and oppugnant Norman-French, into Anglo-Saxon England. The imposition of this foreign tongue, now the exclusive language of the Normans, is the last and incontestable sign of their complete victory over the native inhabitants. This is not the less extraordinary when the Italian Normans also are found for some time obstinately refusing to become Italians. They endeavour to compel the Italians to adopt their French manners and language; histories of the Norman conquest are written at Naples or within the kingdom, in Norman-French.[e] The dialect has adopted some Italian words, but it is still French.[f] Thus within France Teutonism absolutely and entirely surrenders its native tongue, and becomes in the North and in the South of Europe a powerful propagator of a language of Latin descent.

It is not the office of this history to trace the obscure growth of the French language out of the pre-existing elements—the primal Celtic and the Latin. It must not be forgotten that higher up the Celtic and the Latin branch off from the same family—the Indo-Teutonic:[g] so that the actual roots of French words may be reasonably deduced from either. The Christian language, all the titles, terms, and words which related to the religion, were doubtless pure Latin, and survived, but slightly modified, in the French. Pronunciation is among the most powerful agents in the change and formation of language, in the silent abrogation of the old, the silent crystallisation of the

[e] "Moribus et linguâ, quoscunque venire videbant,
Informant propriâ, gens efficiatur ut unum."
—Gul. Appul. Lib. i.; Muratori, v. 255.

[f] Compare on this subject M. Champollion Figeac's preface to the French Chronicle of the Italian Normans, 'Les Normans' (publication of the Société Historique), p. xliv, &c. with the references to Falconet, Lebœuf, Le Grand d'Aussy, and Tiraboschi.

[g] This fact in the history of language, first established by our countryman, Dr. Prichard, in his Essay on the Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, is now admitted by all writers of authority. See also the excellent treatise of M. Pictet, 'L'Affinité des Langues Celtiques avec le Sanscrit.' Mr. Bruce Whyte was unfortunately not master of this branch of Philology, which supersedes at once or modifies his whole system.

new. Certain races, nations, tribes, families, have a predilection, a predisposition, a facility for the utterance of certain sounds. They prefer labial or guttural, hard or soft letters; they almost invariably substitute the mute, the surd, or the aspirate letter for its equivalent; there is an uniformity, if not a rule of change, either from organism or habit. The Italian delights in the termination of words with a soft vowel, the Langue d'Oc with a consonant, the French with a mute vowel. The Latin of the Ritual being a written language, in its structure as well as in its words would inflexibly refuse all change; it would not take the auxiliary verb in place of its conjugations, the article or the preposition to designate its cases; it would adhere to its own declensions, conjugations, inflexions, and so far would stand aloof from the gradual change going on around it; it would become in so far unintelligible to the vulgar ear. But not only, the roots remaining the same, would the great mass of the words retain their significance; there would also be some approximation in the tone and accent. The Clergy, being chiefly of the country, and in their ordinary conversation using the language of the country, would pronounce their Latin with a propensity to the same sounds which were forming the French. Latin as pronounced by an Italian, a Frenchman, or a Spaniard, during the formation and after the formation, of the new tongue, would have a tinge of Italian, French, or Spanish in its utterance. The music being common throughout the Church might perhaps prevent any wide deviation, but whatever deviation there might be would tend to make the meaning of the words more generally and easily comprehensible. So there would be no precise time when the Latin Ritual would become at once and perceptibly a foreign tongue; the common rustic Roman, or the Romance, if not the offspring was probably akin to the ecclesiastical Latin, at all events all Church words or terms would form part of it. And so on the one hand Latin Christianity would have a powerful influence in the creation of the new language, and at the same time never be an unintelligible stranger, hers would be rather a sacred and ancient form of the same language among her lineal and undoubted descendants.

Effect of Church service.

The early poetry of the Langue d'Oil was either the Legend or the Poem of Chivalry. The Trouvère of the North was far more creative than the Troubadour of the South. In his lighter Fabliaux the Trouvère makes no less free with the Christian Clergy and with Christian morals than his brother of the South, but his is the freedom of gaiety or of licentiousness, not of bitter hatred, or pitiless, and contemptuous satire. There is nothing of the savage seriousness of the Provençal.[h]

But the higher Epopee of the Northern Trouvère was almost contemporaneous in its rise with the Crusades; its flourishing period was that of the Crusades, and as far as that was a real and actual state of society, of Chivalry. It is the heroic poetry of mediæval Christianity. The Franks were the warriors, the Franks the poets of the Cross. In both the great Cycles, of Charlemagne and his Peers, of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, in the subordinate cycles, as of Rinaldo, or the four Sons of Aymon, the hero was ever a Christian knight, the enemy, whether knight, giant, or even dragon, was anti-Christian, Saracen, misbeliever, or devil. Charlemagne's war is of the West against the East, of Latin Christianity against Islam; the Gascons and the Basques at Roncesvalles become the splendid Saracens of Spain; the whole misbelieving East is gathered around Christian Paris. The Church avouched the wonders of Archbishop Turpin, adopted the noble fictions about Charlemagne and his Peers. These became part of authorised Christian Legend, when Legend and History were one; when it would have been equal impiety to assert the mythic character of the former as that of the authentic Gospel.[i] So, too, whether Arthur and his Knights sprung, as is most probable, from Breton or from British lays, the Saxondom of his foes recedes, the Paganism, even the Saracenism takes its place. It is not the ancient British King and his British warriors warring with Saxons and Anglians on the borders of Wales, Cumberland, or Cornwall for the dominion of Britain; it is the Christian King

[h] It must not be forgotten that Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante (so little prescient was he of the glory of his pupil) wrote his Tesoretto not in Italian but in French, as of all the vernacular tongues the most likely to be enduring.

[i] Tiraboschi, l. v.

and the Christian knight waging a general war of adventure against unbelievers. It is not the independence of Britain, it is the mystic Sangreal, the cup with the blood of the Redeemer, which is the holy object, the ideal reward of their valour; it is to be the triumph of the most chaste and virtuous as well as of the bravest knight. The sons of Aymon are Southern knights keeping the Spanish borders (Spain reserved her Cid for her own noble old poem), but the Sons of Aymon are adopted Northerns: the Troubadour Poetry knows little or nothing of their chivalry. Toulouse owns only her own unidealised, unromanticised Counts: the few Provençal poems of chivalry are of doubtful origin: their Epic is the dull verse chronicle of the Albigensian War.

But, after all, in this inexhaustible fecundity of her Romance, whether from the rudeness and imperfection of the language at this period of her prolific creativeness, or from some internal inaptitude in French for this high class of poetry, from want of vigour, metrical harmony, and variety, or even from its excellence, its analytical clearness and precision, the Mediæval Poetry of Northern France, with all its noble, chivalrous, and crusading impulses, called forth no poet of enduring fame. The Homer of this race of cyclic poets was to be an Italian. It was not till these poems had sunk into popular tales; till, from the poem recited in the castle or the court of the King or the Baron, they had become disseminated among the people;[k] not till they had spread into Italy, and as the 'Reali di Francia' had been over and over again recited by the professional story-tellers, and been rudely versified by humbler poets, that they were seized first by the bold and accomplished Boiardo, afterwards by the inimitable Ariosto, and in their full ancient spirit, yet

[k] "Tutte le meraviglie ch' oggi leggiamo nè romanzi o poemi, che hanno per suggetto i Paladini, erano allora raccontate al popolo dai novellatori; e quest' uso rimane in alcune città, e specialmente in Venezia e in Napoli sino a quest' ultimi anni. Chiunque non sapeva leggere, si raccoglieva quasi ogni sera d' estate intorno il novellatore su la riva del mare," &c. &c.—Foscolo, Discorso, v. p. 229. This accounts at once for the adoption of such subjects by Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto, when the high tide of classical letters had not passed away; as well as for the unbounded popularity of their poems, and of countless other epics, once common as the stones in the streets, now the rarities of the choicest libraries.

with some fine modern irony, bequeathed to mankind in the most exquisite and harmonious Italian. Even the Crusades were left to the gentle and romantic Tasso, when the religious fire of the Crusades and of Chivalry was all but extinct in its cold faint embers.

But if the Crusades, and by the Crusades Latin Christianity, did not create enduring French poetry, they created the form of history in which France has excelled all Europe. Perhaps of vernacular history, properly so called, the Florentine Villani is the parent; of political history, Dino Compagni; but that history, which delights from its reality and truth, as springing from the personal observation, instinct with the personal character, alive with all the personal feelings of the historian, the model and type of the delightful Memoir, is to be found first in Villehardouin and Joinville, to rise to still higher perfection in Froissart and in De Comines. No cold later epic on St. Louis will rival the poetry of Joinville.

CHAPTER VII.

TEUTONIC LANGUAGES.

IN all the Romance languages, as it has appeared, in all languages of Latin descent, Italian, French both in its northern and southern form, Spanish in all its dialects, the religious vocabulary, every word which expressed Christian notions, or described Christian persons, was Latin, only lengthened out or shortened, deflected, or moulded according to the genius of each tongue; they were the same words with some difference of pronunciation or form, but throughout retaining their primal sense; the words, even if indistinctly understood, had at least an associated significance, they conveyed, if not fully, partially to all, their proper meaning. Teutonic languages.

In the Teutonic languages it was exactly the reverse. For all the primal and essential Christian notions the German found its own words; it was only what may be called the Church terms, the ecclesiastical functions and titles, which it condescended or was compelled to borrow from the Latin.[a] The highest of all, "God," with all its derivatives, the "Godhead, godly, godlike," was in sound entirely remote from "Deus, the deity, the divinity, the divine." As to the attributes of God, the German had his own word for allmightiness, for the titles the all-merciful or all-gracious.[b] For the Trinity, indeed, as in all Indo-

[a] M. Regnier, in a Mémoire in the last year's Transactions of the Academy (p. 324), has summed up in a few clear French sentences, the substance of a learned work by Rudolf Raumer, which I have read with much profit. 'Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache.' Berlin, 1851. "Un fait remarquable, et qui prouve bien avec quel soin jaloux la langue se conservait pure de toute mélange étrangère, c'est qu'au moment même de l'introduction du Christianisme, qui apportait tant d'idées nouvelles, elle n'eut pas besoin d'emprunter au Grec et au Latin les mots qui les rendaient, que ses propres ressources lui suffirent en grande partie, surtout pour l'expression des sentiments qui appartenaient à la foi Chrétienne, et que ce ne fut guère que pour l'organisation extérieure de l'Eglise, qu'elle reçut en partie du dehors les mots avec les faits."—In a note M. Regnier illustrates these assertions by examples, many of them the same as those cited in my text.

[b] Compounds from Macht—Barmherzigkeit—Gnade.

Teutonic languages, the numerals are so nearly akin, that there would be at least a close assonance, if not identity, in the words; and the primitive word for "father" is so nearly an universal, that the Latin "Pater" might be dimly discerned under the broader Teutonic pronunciation, "Fader." But the "Son and the Holy Ghost"[c] were pure, unapproaching Teuton. The names of the Saviour, "Jesus," and "the Christ," passed of course into the creed and ritual; but the "Lord," and the German "Herr," were Teuton, as were the "healer, health," for the "Saviour and salvation," the "atonement" for the "propitiation."[d] In the older versions the now ignoble words "hanging and the gallows" were used instead of the Crucifixion and the Cross: the "Resurrection" takes a German form.[e] The "Angels and the Devils" underwent but little change; but all the special terms of the Gospel, "the soul, sin, holiness, faith, prayer, repentance, penance, confession, conversion, heaven and hell, Doomsday, even Baptism and the Lord's Supper," were new and peculiar.[f] The Book;[g] the Seer not the Prophet;[h] above all, the great Festivals of Christmas and Easter,[i] were original, without relation in sound or in letters to the Latin. Of the terms which discriminated the Christian from the Unbeliever one was different; the Christian, of course, was of all languages, the Gentile or the Pagan became a "heathen." So too "the world" took another name. To the German instructed through these religious words, the analogous vocabulary of the Latin service was utterly dead and without meaning; the Latin Gospel was a sealed book, the Latin service a succession of unintelligible sounds. The offices and titles of the Clergy alone, at least of the Bishop and the Deacon, as well as the Monk, the Abbot,

[c] Der Sohn, der Heilige Geist.

[d] Der Herr, Heiland, Heil.

[e] Notker and Otfried use "hengan und galgen." — Auferstehung, Rodolf Raumer, b. iii.

[f] Seele, Sunde, Schuld, Heiligkeit, Glaube, Gebete, Reue, Busse, Beichte, Bekehrung, Himmel, Hölle, Taufe, Heiliger Abendmahl.

[g] Rodolf Raumer, b. iii.

[h] Ulphilas used the word praufetus. See Zahn's glossary to his edition of Ulphilas, p. 70. The German word is Seher, or Wahrsager.

[i] Weihnacht. Ostara (in Anglo-Saxon, Easter) paraît avoir désigné dans des temps plus anciens une Déesse Germanique dont la fête se célébrait vers la même époque que notre Fête de Pâques, et qui avait donné son nom au mois d'Avril.—Grimm, Mythologie, p. 267, 8vo., 2e edit., &c. &c. M. Regnier might have added to his authorities that of Bede, who in his de Comp. Temporum gives this derivation . . . Pfingsten is Pentecost.

"the Prior, the Cloister," were transferred and received as honoured strangers in the land, in which the office was as new as the name.[k] "The Martyr" was unknown but to Christianity, therefore the name lived. "The Church" the Teuton derived, perhaps through the Gothic of Ulphilas, from the Greek;[m] but besides this single word there is no sign of Greek more than of Latin in the general Teutonic Christian language.[n] The Bible of Ulphilas was that of an ancient race, which passed away with that race; it does not appear to have been known to the Germans east of the Rhine, or to the great body of the Teutons, who were converted to Christianity some centuries later, from the seventh to the eleventh. The Germans who crossed the Rhine or the Alps came within the magic circle of the Latin; they submitted to a Latin Priesthood; they yielded up their primitive Teuton, content with forcing many of their own words, which were of absolute necessity, perhaps some of their inflexions, into the language which they ungraciously adopted. The descendants of the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, the Lombards, by degrees spoke languages of which the Latin was the groundwork; they became in every sense Latin Christians.

Our Anglo-Saxon ancestors were the first Teutonic race which remained Teuton. It is a curious problem how the Roman Missionaries from the South, and the Celtic Missionaries from the North, wrought the conversion of Anglo-Saxondom.[o] Probably the early conversions in most parts of the island were hardly more than ceremonial; the substitution of one rite for another; the deposing one God and accepting another, of which they knew not much more than the name; and the subjection to one Priesthood, who seemed to have more powerful influence in heaven, instead of another who had ceased to command

Anglo-Saxon.

[k] Pfaffe, the more common word for Clericus, is from Papa.—Raumer, p. 295. It is curious that in the oldest translators the High Priests, Annas and Caiaphas, are Bishops.—Ibid. 297.

[m] Walafrid Strabo gives this derivation from the Greek through the Gothic. The word is, I believe, not found in the extant part of Ulphilas.

[n] Even the word "Catholic" is superseded by "Allgemeine."

[o] Augustine addressed Ethelbert through an interpreter. The Queen and her retinue were French, and used to intercourse with a Latin priesthood.

success in war, or other blessings which they expected at his hands. This appears from the ease and carelessness with which the religion was for some period accepted and thrown off again. As in the island, or in each separate kingdom, the Christian or the Heathen King, the Christian or the Heathen party was the stronger, so Christianity rose and fell. It was not till the rise of a Priesthood of Anglo-Saxon birth under Wilfrid, or during his time, that England received true Christian instruction; it was not till it had, if not an Anglo-Saxon ritual, Anglo-Saxon hymns, legends, poetry, sermons, that it can be properly called Christian; and all those in their religious vocabulary are Teutonic, not Latin. It was in truth notorious that, even among the Priesthood, Latin had nearly died out, at least if not the traditional skill of repeating its words, the knowledge of its meaning.

Our Anglo-Saxon Fathers were the first successful missionaries in Trans-Rhenane Germany. The Celt Columban and St. Gall were hermits and cœnobites, not missionaries; and with their Celtic may have communicated, if they encountered them, with the aboriginal Gauls, but they must chiefly have made their way through Latin. They settled within the pale of Roman Gaul, built their monasteries on the sites of old Roman cities; their proselytes (for they made monks at least, if not numerous converts to the faith) were Gallo-Romans.[p] But no doubt the Anglo-Saxon of Winfrid (Boniface) and his brother apostles of Germany was the means of intercourse; the kindred language enabled them to communicate freely and successfully with the un-Romanised races: Teutons were the apostles of Teutons. It was through the

[p] Columban has left a few lines of Latin poetry. While his Celticism appears from his obstinate adherence to the ancient British usage about Easter, it is strange that he should be mixed up with the controversy about the "three Chapters." M. Ampère has pointed out the singular contrast between the adulation of Columban's letter to Pope Boniface on this subject, "pulcherrimo omnium totius Europæ ecclesiarum capiti . . . Papæ prædicto, præcelso, præsenti (præstanti?) pastorum pastori . . . humillimus celsissimo, agrestis urbano," and the bold and definite language of the letter itself: "Jamdiu enim potestas apud vos erit, quamdiu recta ratio permanserit. Dolere se de infamiâ quæ cathedræ S. Petri inuritur."—Annal. Benedict. i. 274. Compare Ampère, Hist. Lit. de la France, iii. p. 9. The Celt is a Latin in language rather than in thought.

persuasive accents of a tongue, in its sounds as in its words closely resembling their own, not in the commanding tones of foreign Latin, that the religion found its way to their hearts and minds. Charlemagne's conversions in the further north were at first through an instrument in barbarous ages universally understood, the sword. Charlemagne was a Teuton warring on Teutons: he would need no interpreter for the brief message of his evangelic creed to the Saxons—"Baptism or death." Their conversion was but the sign of submission, shaken off constantly during the long wars, and renewed on every successful inroad of the conqueror. But no doubt in the bishoprics and the monasteries, the religious colonies with which Charlemagne really achieved the Christianisation of a large part of Germany, though the services might be in Latin, the schools might instruct in Latin, and the cloister language be Latin, German youths educated as Clergy or as Monks could not forget or entirely abandon their mother tongue.[q] Latin and German became insensibly mingled, and interpenetrated each other. As to the general language of the country, there was an absolute necessity that the strangers should yield to the dominant Teutonism, rather than, like Rome of old in her conquered provinces, impose their language on the subject people. The Empire of Charlemagne till his death maintained its unity. The great division began to prevail during the reign of Louis the Pious, between the German and the Frank portions of the Empire. By that time the Franks (though German was still spoken in the north-east, between the Rhine and the Meuse) had become blended and assimilated with those who at least had begun to speak the Langue d'Oil and

[q] Dem Kloster S. Gallen wird im 10ten Jahrhundert nachgerühmt, dass nur die Kleinsten Knaben seiner Schule sich der Deutschen Sprache bedienten; alle übrigen aber mussten ihre Conversation Lateinisch führen. In den meisten Fällen aber lief natürlich der Gebrauch der Deutschen Muttersprache neben dem der Lateinischen her. Daher enstand jene Mischung Lateinischer mit Deutsche Worte, die wir in so vielen Glossen handschriften der Althochdeutschen Zeit finden. Man erklärte bei der Auslegung Lateinischer Texte die schwierigeren Wörter entweder durch gelaüfigere Lateinische oder auch durch entsprechende Deutsche. Dadurch musste eine fortdauernde Wechselwirkung zwischen dem Lateinischen und Deutschen in den Klöstern entstehen.—Raumer, p. 201. Otfried, the German sacred poet, owed his education to the scholar and theologian, H. Rhabanus Maurus.

the Langue d'Oc.[r] But before the oath at Strasburg had as it were pronounced the divorce between the two realms, Teutonic preachers had addressed German homilies to the people, parts of the Scripture had found their way into Germany, German vernacular poets had begun to familiarise the Gospel history to the German ear, the Monks aspired to be vernacular poets.[s] As in Anglo-Saxon England, so in the dominions of Louis the Pious, and of Lothaire, the Heliand, and the Harmony of the Gospels by Otfried, had opened the Bible, at least the New Testament, to the popular ear. The Heliand was written in the dialect of Lower Saxony. Otfried, a Monk of Weissenberg in Alsace, wrote in High German. The Heliand is alliterative verse, Otfried in rhyme. Otfried wrote his holy poem to wean the minds of men from their worldly songs; the history of the Redeemer was to supplant the songs of the old German heroes. How far Otfried succeeded in his pious design is not known, but even in the ninth century other Christian poetry, a poem on St. Peter; a legend of St. Gall, a poem on the miracles of the Holy Land, introduced Christian thoughts and Christian imagery into the hearts of the people.[t]

Thus Christianity began to speak to mankind in Greek; it had spoken for centuries in the commanding Latin; henceforth it was to address a large part of the

[r] See above, from the canons of the Councils of Tours, Rheims, and Mentz.

[s] See on the Vienna fragments of the old German translation of St. Matthew, and the version of the Gospel Harmony of Ammianus, Notker's Psalms, the Lord's Prayer, and Creed.—Raumer, pp. 35 *et seqq.*

[t] On the Heliand and on Otfried see the powerful criticism of Gervinus, Geschichte der Poetischen National Literatur der Deutschen, i. p. 84, *et seqq.* Neither are translators; they are rather paraphrasts of the Gospel. The Saxon has more of the popular poet, Otfried more of the religious teacher; in Otfried the poet appears, in the Saxon he is lost in his poetry. Where the Saxon leaves the text of the Gospel, it is in places where the popular poetry offers him matter and expression for epic amplification or adornment, as in the Murder of the Innocents; and wherein the description of the Last Judgement he reminds us of the Scandinavian imagery of the destruction of the world: in this not altogether unlike the fragment of the Muspeli edited by Schmeller. Instead of this, Otfried cites passages of the Prophets Joel and Zephaniah. On the whole, the Saxon has an epic, Otfried a lyric and didactic character. Gervinus thinks but meanly of Otfried as a poet. The whole passage is striking and instructive. The Heliand has been edited by Schmeller; and Otfried best by Graff, Konigsberg, 1831. Compare Lachman's article in Ersch und Grüber's Encyclopädie. The Poem on St. Gall exists only in a fragment of a Latin translation in Pertz, ii. p. 33. The first is in Hoffman, Geschichte des Deutschen Kirchenliedes; the last in Vit. Altman. in Pez. Script. Rer. Austriac. i. p. 117.

world in Teutonic. France and Spain were Romanised as well as Christianised. Germany was Christianised, but never Romanised. England, Germanised by the Anglo-Saxon conquest, was partially Romanised again by the Normans, who, in their province of France, had entirely yielded to the Gallo-Roman element. Westward of the Rhine and south of the Danube, the German conquerors were but a few, an armed aristocracy; in Germany they were the mass of the people. However, therefore, Roman religion, to a certain extent Roman law, ruled eastward of the Rhine, each was a domiciled stranger. The Teuton in character, in habits, in language, remained a Teuton. As their tribes of old united for conquest; the conquest achieved, severed again to erect independent kingdoms; as the Roman Empire in Germany was at last but a half-naturalised fiction, controlled, limited, fettered by the independent Kings, Princes, and Prelates: so, as our History has shown, there was a constant struggle in the German Churchman between the Churchman and the Teuton—a gravitating tendency towards Roman unity in the Churchman, a repulsion towards independence in the Teuton. But for the Imperial claims on Italy and on Rome, which came in aid of the ecclesiastical centralisation under the Papacy, Teutonism might perhaps have much earlier burst free from the Latin unity.

The Norman conquest brought England back into the Roman pale; it warred as sternly against the independence of the Anglo-Saxon Bishop as against that of the Anglo-Saxon thane; it introduced the Latin religious phraseology. Hence in England we in many cases retain and use almost indifferently both the Latin and the Teutonic terms; in some instances only we inflexibly adhere to our vernacular religious language, and show a loyal predilection for the Saxon tongue. "God" and "the Lord" retain their uninvaded majesty. "The Son" admits no rival, but we admit the Holy *Spirit* as well as the Holy *Ghost*, but the Holy Ghost "sanctifies." The attributes of God, except his Almightiness and his wisdom, are more often used in theological discussion than in popular speech. Therefore his "omnipresence," his "omniscience" (he is also "all-knowing"), his "ubiquity," his "infinity," his

"incomprehensibility," are Latin. In the titles of Christ, the "Saviour," the "Redeemer," the "Intercessor," except in the "Atonement," instead of the "Propitiation or Reconciliation," Latin has obtained the mastery. "Sin" is Saxon; "righteousness" a kind of common property; "mercy and love" may contend for pre-eminence; "goodness" is genuine German; "faith and charity" are Latin; "love," German. We await "Doomsday, or the Day of Judgement;" but "Heaven and Hell" are pure Teutonisms.[u] "Baptism" is Latinised Greek. The "Lord's Supper" contests with the "Eucharist;" the "Holy Communion" mingles the two. "Easter" is our Paschal Feast. We speak of Gentiles and Pagans, as well as "Heathens." Our inherited Greek, "Church," retains its place; as does "priest," from the Greek presbyter. In common with all Teutons, our ecclesiastical titles, with this exception, are borrowed.

During this period of suspended Teutonic life in England, Germany had not yet receded into her rigid Teutonism. The Crusades united Christendom, Latin and German, in unresisting and spontaneous confederacy. The Franks, as has been seen, were in the van; Germany followed sluggishly, reluctantly, at intervals, made at least two great paroxysmal efforts under the Emperors, who themselves headed the armaments, but then collapsed into something bordering on apathy. From that time only single Princes and Prelates girt themselves with the Cross. The long feud, the open war of the Emperors and the Popes, was no strife between the races; the Emperor warred not for German interests, but for his own; it was as King of the Romans, with undefined rights over the Lombard and Tuscan cities, later as King of Naples as well as Emperor of Germany, that he maintained the internecine strife. If Frederick II. had been a German, not a Sicilian; if his capital had been Cologne or Mentz or Augsburg, not Palermo or Naples; if his courtly language, the language of his statesmen and poets, had been a noble German, rising above the clashing and confused dialects of High and Low, Franconian, Swabian, Bavarian;

[u] The German Heiden is clearly analogous in its meaning to Pagan; the word is not the Greek Ethnic.

if he had possessed the power and the will to legislate for Germany as he legislated for Apulia, different might have been the issue of the conflict.

Throughout all this period, the true mediæval period, Germany was as mediæval as the rest of Christendom. Her poets were as fertile in chivalrous romances; whether translated or founded on those of the Trouvères, there is not a poem on any of the great cycles, the classical or that from ancient history, those of Charlemagne or of Arthur, not a tale of adventure, which has not its antitype in German verse, in one or other of the predominant dialects. The legends of the Saints of all classes and countries (the romances of religious adventure) are drawn out with the same inexhaustible fecundity, to the same interminable length.[x] The somewhat later Minnesingers echo the amatory songs of the Troubadours; and everywhere, as in France and England, the vernacular first mingles in grotesque incongruity with the Latin Mystery; scenes of less dignity, sometimes broadly comic in the vulgar tongue, are interpolated into the more solemn and stately Latin spectacle.

When the Norman dynasty, and with the Norman dynasty the dominance of the Norman language came to an end, nearly at the same period the English constitution and the English language began to develope themselves in their mingled character, but with Teutonism resuming its superiority. As in the constitution the Anglo-Saxon common law, so in the structure and vocabulary of the language the Anglo-Saxon was the broad groundwork. Poetry rose with the language; and it is singular to observe that the earliest English poems of original force and fancy (we had before only dry dull histories of Wace, and Robert of Gloucester, Norman rather than English[y]), the Vision and the Creed of Piers Ploughman, while they borrow their allegorical images from the school of the

[x] Many of these poems, sacred and profane, of enormous length, Titurel, the Kaiser Chronik, Kutrun, as well as the great "Passional" and the "Marienleben," are in course of publication at Quedlinburg, in the Bibliothek der Deutschen National Literatur.

[y] The Ormulum, which I believe has not yet been edited, is a paraphrase of the Gospels (it would be curious to compare it with the older Teutonic Heliand and Otfried) in verse and language, of a kind of transition period, by some called semi-Saxon. See on the Ormulum, Introduction to Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.

Romance of the Rose, adopt the alliterative verse of the old Anglo-Saxon. The Romance of the Rose by its extraordinary popularity had introduced the Impersonated Virtues and Vices, which had almost driven out the knights and the saints of the Romance and the Legend; instead of the wild tale of chivalrous adventure, or the holy martyrdom, poetry became a long and weary allegory: even the Mystery before long gave place to the Morality. In some degree this may have been the Morals of Christianity reasserting coequal dignity and importance against ritual observances and blind sacerdotal authority: it is constantly rebuking with grave solemnity, or keen satire, the vices of the Clergy, the Monks, and the Friars.

Before Chaucer, even before Wycliffe, appeared with his rude satire, his uncouth alliterative verse, his homely sense, and independence of thought, the author of Piers Ploughman's Vision.[z] This extraordinary manifestation of the religion, of the language, of the social and political notions, of the English character, of the condition, of the passions and feelings of rural and provincial England, commences, and with Chaucer and Wycliffe completes the revelation of this transition period, the reign of Edward III. Throughout its institutions, language, religious sentiment, Teutonism is now holding its first initiatory struggle with Latin Christianity. In Chaucer is heard a voice from the court, from the castle, from the city, from universal England. All orders of society live in his verse, with the truth and originality of individual being, yet each a type of every rank, class, every religious and social condition and pursuit. And there can be no doubt that his is a voice of freedom, of more or less covert hostility to the hierarchal system, though more playful and with a poet's genial appreciation of all which was true, healthful, and beautiful in the old faith. In Wycliffe is heard a voice from the University, from the seat of theology and scholastic philosophy, from the centre and stronghold of the hierarchy; a voice of revolt and defiance, taken up and echoed in the pulpit

[z] The Vision bears its date about 1365. Chaucer's great work is about twenty years later. Wycliffe was hardly known, but by his tract on the Last Days, before 1370. Whitaker, p. xxxvi. and last note to Introduction. Also Wright's Preface.

throughout the land against the sacerdotal domination. In the Vision of Piers Ploughman is heard a voice from the wild Malvern Hills, the voice it should seem of an humble parson, or secular priest. He has passed some years in London, but his home, his heart is among the poor rural population of central Mercian England. Tradition, uncertain tradition, has assigned a name to the Poet, Robert Langland, born at Cleobury Mortimer, in Shropshire, and of Oriel College, Oxford. Whoever he was, he wrote in his provincial idiom, in a rhythm perhaps from the Anglo-Saxon times familiar to the popular ear; if it strengthened and deepened that feeling, no doubt the poem was the expression of a strong and wide-spread feeling. It is popular in a broader and lower sense than the mass of vernacular poetry in Germany and England. We must rapidly survey the religion, the politics, the poetry of the Ploughman.

The Visionary is no disciple, no precursor of Wycliffe in his broader religious views: the Loller of Piers Ploughman is no Lollard; he applies the name as a term of reproach for a lazy indolent vagrant.[a] The Poet is no dreamy speculative theologian; he acquiesces seemingly with unquestioning faith in the creed and in the usages of the Church. He is not profane but reverent as to the Virgin and the Saints. Pilgrimages, penances, oblations on the altar, absolution, he does not reject, though they are all nought in comparison with holiness and charity; on Transubstantiation and the Real Presence and the Sacraments he is almost silent, but his silence is that of submission not of doubt.[b] It is in his intense absorbing moral feeling that he is beyond his age: with him outward observances are but hollow shows, mockeries, hypocrisies without the inward power of religion. It is not so much in his keen cutting satire on all matters of the Church as his solemn

[a] Passus Sextus, p. 75 and elsewhere, Loller's life is begging at buttery hatches, and loitering on Fridays or Feast Days at Church, p. 76.

[b] There is a very curious passage as to the questions even then agitated:—

"I have Heard High men,—eating at the table,
Carp as though they Clerks were,—of Christ and his might,
And laid Faults on the Father—that Formed us all . . .
Why would our Saviour Suffer,—Such a worm in his bliss
That beguiled the woman—and the man after."
—Wright, 179.

The religious poet puts down these questions with holy indignation.

I quote mostly from Dr. Whitaker's edition, sometimes from Wright's, taking the liberty of modernising only the spelling, which shows how near most of it is to our vernacular English.

installation of Reason and Conscience as the guides of the self-directed soul, that he is breaking the yoke of sacerdotal domination: in his constant appeal to the plainest, simplest Scriptural truths, as in themselves the whole of religion, he is a stern reformer. The sad serious Satirist, in his contemplation of the world around him, the wealth of the world and the woe,[c] sees no hope, no consolation but in a new order of things, in which if the hierarchy shall subsist, it shall subsist in a form, with powers, in a spirit totally opposite to that which now rules mankind. The mysterious Piers the Ploughman seems to designate from what quarter that reformer is to arise. Piers the Ploughman, who at one time was a sort of impersonation of the industrious and at the same time profoundly religious man, becomes at the close Piers Pardon Ploughman, the great publisher of the pardon of mankind through Christ. In him is the teaching, absolving power of the Church; he is the great assertor and conservator of Unity.

With Wycliffe, with the spiritual Franciscans, Langland ascribes all the evils, social and religious, of the dreary world to the wealth of the Clergy, of the Monks, and the still more incongruous wealth of the Mendicants. With them he asserts the right, the duty, the obligation of the temporal Sovereign to despoil the hierarchy of their corrupting and fatal riches.[d] As he has nothing of the scholastic subtlety, of the Predestinarianism, or speculative freedom of Wycliffe, so he has nothing of the wild spiritualist belief in the prophecies of ages to come. With the Fraticelli, to him the fatal gift of Constantine was the doom of true religion; with them he almost adores poverty, but it is industrious down-trodden rustic poverty; not that of the impostor beggar,[e] common in his days, and denounced as sternly as by the political economy of our own, still less of the reli-

[c] "And Marvellously me Met—as I May you tell,
All the Wealth of the World—and the Woe both."—p. 2.

[d] "For if Possession be Poison—and imPerfect these make
The Heads of Holy Church,
It were Charity to disCharge them for Holy Church sake,
And Purge them of the old Poison."
—p. 298.
See the whole passage.

[e] See Passus IV. where Waster refuses to Work, and Piers summons Want to seize him by the paunch, and wring him well. The whole contrast of the industrious and idle poor is remarkable. Also the Impostors and Jolly Beggars, as of our own days, and the favourable view of "God's Minstrels." —Whitaker, p. 154. This passage was not in Mr. Wright's copy.

gious mendicant. Both these are fiercely excluded from his all-embracing charity.[f]

Langland is Antipapal, yet he can admire an ideal Pope, a general pacificator, reconciling the Sovereigns of the world to universal amity.[g] It is the actual Pope, the Pope of Avignon or of Rome, levying the wealth of the world to slay mankind, who is the object of his bitter invective.[h] The Cardinals he denounces with the same indignant scorn; but chiefly the Cardinal Legate, whom he has seen in England riding in his pride and pomp, with lewdness, rapacity, merciless extortion, insolence in his train.[i] Above all, his hatred (it might seem that on this all honest English indignation was agreed) is against the Mendicant orders. Of the older monks there is almost total silence. For St. Benedict, for St. Dominic, for St. Francis he has the profoundest reverence.[k] But it is against their degenerate sons that he arrays his allegorical Host; the Friars furnish every impersonated vice, are foes to every virtue; his bitterest satire, his keenest irony (and these weapons he wields with wonderful poetic force) are against their dissoluteness, their idleness, their pride, their rapacity, their arts, their lies, their hypocrisy, their intrusion into the functions of the Clergy, their delicate attire, their dainty feasts, their magnificent buildings,[m] even their proud learning; above all their hardness, their pitilessness to the poor, their utter want of charity, which with Langland is the virtue of virtues.

[f] Pass. vi. p. 76.

[g] "Sithen Prayed to the Pope,—have Pity of Holy Church,
And no Grace to Grant—till Good love were,
Among all Kind of Kings—over Christian people,
Command all Confessors that any King shrive
Enjoin him Peace for his Penance—and Perpetual forgiveness."—p. 85.

[h] Simony and Civil go to Rome to put themselves under the Pope's protection,—P. iii. p. 36.

"And God amend the Pope—that Pilleth Holy Church,
And Claimeth by force to be King—to be Keeper over Christendom,
And Counteth not how Christian Men be Killed and robbed,
And Findeth Folk to Fight,—and Christian blood to spill."—Do Best, p. 1, p. 389.

Compare p. 297.

[i] "The Country is the Curseder,—that Cardinals Come in,
And where they Lie and Linger,—Lechery there reigneth."—Wright, p. 420.

[k] Pass. v. p. 70.

[m] He scoffs at those who wish their names to appear in the rich painted windows of the Franciscan churches. The Friar absolves Mede (Bribery)—

"And sithen he seyde,
We have a window in werkynge.
Woldest thou glaze that gable,
And grave there thy name,
Nigher should thy soul be
Heaven to have."—Wright, p. 46.

There is a full account in "the Creed" of a spacious and splendid Dominican Convent, very curious. "The Creed" is of a later date, of another author, an avowed Lollard.

Against the Clergy he is hardly less severe ;[n] he sternly condemns their dastardly desertion of their flocks, when during the great plague they crowded to London to live an idle life: that idle life he describes with singular spirit and zest. Yet he seems to recognise the Priesthood as of Divine institution. Against the whole host of officials, pardoners, summoners, Archdeacons, and their functionaries; against lawyers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, he is everywhere fiercely and contemptuously criminatory.

His political views are remarkable.[o] He has a notion of a king ruling in the affections of the people, with Reason for his chancellor, Conscience for his justiciary. On such a King the commonalty would cheerfully and amply bestow sufficient revenue for all the dignity of his office, and the exigencies of the state, even for his conquests. No doubt that Commonalty would first have absorbed the wealth of the hierarchy.[p] He is not absolutly superior to that hatred of the French, nor even to the ambition for the conquest of France engendered by Edward's wars and by his victories. And yet his shrewd common sense cannot but see the injustice and cruelty of those aggressive and sanguinary wars.[q]

As a Poet Langland has many high qualities. He is creating his own language, and that in a rude and remote province: its groundwork is Saxon-English, exclusively so in most of its words and in its idioms. It admits occasionally French words, but they appear like strangers; his Latinisms, and words of Latin descent, might seem drawn

[n] He declares that the Clergy shall fall as the Templars had fallen.—Do Bet, i. p. 297. But compare Wright, i. p. 233.

[o] There is a strange cross of aristocratical feeling in Langland's levelling notions. That slaves and bastards should be advanced to be clergymen is a crying grievance. They should be sons of franklins and freemen, if not of Lords:

"And such Bondsmens Bairns have Been made Bishops,
And Barons Bastards have Been Archdeacons,
And Soapers (soap-boilers) and their Sons for Silver have been Knights,
And Lords sons their Labourers."

The Barons mortgaged their estates to go to the wars. They were bought, this is curious, by traders.

[p] What the Commons require of the King is Law, Love, and Truth, and himself for their Lord antecedent (p. 57):

"And I dare Lay my Life that Love would Lend that silver
To Wage (to pay the wages of) them, and help Win that thou Wittest after,
More than all the Merchants, or than the Mitred Bishops,
Or Lombards of Lucca, that Live by Love as Jews."—P. 74.

[q] Had Mede been Seneschal in France, K. Edward would have conquered the length and breadth of the land.—Pass. iv. p. 51. In another passage, he had won France by gentleness.—Do Wel, p. 250.

directly from the Vulgate Scriptures and the Church services. These he constantly cites in the original Latin. With his Anglo-Saxon alliteration there is a cadence or rhythm in his verse; while Chaucer is writing in rhyme Langland seems utterly ignorant of that poetic artifice. The whole poem is an allegory, by no means without plan, but that plan obscure, broken, and confused; I am inclined to think wanting its close. The Allegory is all his own. The universal outburst of Allegory at this time in Paris, in Germany, in England is remarkable. It had full vogue in Paris, in Rutebeuf, and in the Romance of the Rose, which Chaucer translated into English. As the chivalrous romance and the fabliaux had yielded to the allegorical poem, so also the drama. It might seem, as we have said, as if the awakening moral sense of men, weary of the saints, and angels, and devils, delighted in those impersonations of the unchristian vices and Christian virtues. That which to us is languid, wearisome, unreal, seized most powerfully on the imagination of all orders. Nor had allegory fulfilled its office in the imaginative realm of letters till it had called forth Spencer and Bunyan. Langland, I am disposed to think, approaches much nearer to Bunyan than the Romance of the Rose to the Fairy Queen. But Langland, with all his boldness, and clearness, and originality, had too much which was temporary, much which could not but become obsolete. Bunyan's vision was more simple, had more, if it may be so said, of the moral, or of the scheme, of perpetual, universal Christianity. But Spencer himself has hardly surpassed some few touches by which Langland has designated his personages; and there is at times a keen quiet irony too fine for Bunyan.

The Poem is manifestly in two parts; the poet, asleep on the Malvern Hills, beholds the whole world; eastward a magnificent tower, the dwelling of Truth; opposite a deep dale, the abode of unblessed spirits; between them a wide plain, in which mankind are following all their avocations. He dwells rapidly on the evils and abuse of all Orders. A stately lady, in white raiment (Holy Church) offers herself as guide to the Castle of Truth, in which is

seated the Blessed Trinity. The first five passages of the first part are on the redress of civil wrongs, the last on the correction of religious abuses. Mede (Bribery) with all her crew are on one side; on the other Conscience, who refuses to be wedded to Mede,[r] with Reason on the other. It closes with the King's appointment of Conscience as his Justiciary, of Reason as his Chancellor. In the Sixth Passage the Dreamer awakes; he encounters Reason. As Reason with Conscience is the great antagonist of social and political evil, so again, Reason, vested as a Pope, with Conscience as his Cross Bearer, is alone to subdue religious evil. For that evil God is visiting the earth with awful pestilences and storms. To avert God's wrath the domestic duties must be observed with fervent affection; the Pope must have pity on the Church, the religious Orders keep to their rule, those who go on pilgrimages to the Saints seek rather Truth. Truth is the one eternal object of man. After Repentance has brought all the seven deadly sins to confession[s] (a strange powerful passage), Hope blows a trumpet, whose blast is to compel mankind to seek Grace from Christ to find out Truth. But no pilgrim who has wandered over the world can show the way to Truth. Now suddenly arises Piers Ploughman; he has long known Truth; she has been his faithful follower. Meekness and the Ten Commandments are the way to, Grace is the Portress of the noble Castle of Truth.

[r] Conscience objects to Mede that she is false and faithless, misleading men by her treasure, leading wives and widows to wantonness. Falsehood and she undid the King's Father (Edward II.), poisoned Popes, impaired holy Church; she is a strumpet to the basest Sizours of the common law, summoners of the civil law prize her highly, sheriffs of counties would be undone without her, for she causes men to forfeit lands and lives; she bribes gaolers to let out prisoners, imprisons true men, hangs the innocent. She cares not for being excommunicated in the Consistory Court; she buys absolution by a cope to the Commissary. She can do almost as much work as the King's Privy Seal in 120 days. She is intimate with the Pope, as provisors show. She and Simony seal his Bulls. She consecrates Bishops without learning. She presents Rectors to prebends, maintains priests in keeping concubines and begetting bastards contrary to the Canon, &c. &c. —P. iii. p. 46.

[s] The confession of Covetousness is admirable:—

"Didst thou ever make restitution?
Yes, I once Robbed some Chapmen, and Rifled their trunks."

Covetousness would go hang herself—but even for her Repentance has comfort:—

"Have Mercy in thy Mind—and with thy Mouth beseech it,
For Goddes Mercy is More—than all his other works,
And all the Wickedness of the World—that man might Work or think
Is no More to the Mercy of God—than in the Sea a glede (a spark of fire)."—Wright, p. 94.

After some time Truth reveals herself. She commands Piers to stay at home, to tend his plough; of the young peasantry industry in their calling is their highest duty; to the laborious poor is offered plenary pardon, and to those who protect them, Kings who rule in righteousness, holy Bishops who justly maintain Church discipline. Less plenary pardon is bestowed on less perfect men, merchants, lawyers who plead for hire. What is this pardon? it is read by a Priest; it contains but these words: "They that have done good shall go into life eternal, they that have done evil into everlasting fire."[t]

Thus with Piers Ploughman, a holy Christian life, a life of love, of charity, of charity especially to the poor, is all in all; on the attainment of that life dwells the second Vision, the latter part of the poem. There are three personages by the plain names of Do Well, Do Bet (do better), and Do Best. The whole of this ascent through the different degrees of the Christian life is described with wonderful felicity; every power, attribute, faculty of man, every virtue, every vice is impersonated with the utmost life and truth. The result of the whole is that the essence of the Christian life, the final end of Do Well, is charity. Do Bet appears to have a higher office, to teach other men; and this part closes with a splendid description of the Redeemer's life and passion, and that which displays the poetic power of Robert Langland higher perhaps than any other passage, that mysterious part of the Saviour's function between his passion and resurrection commonly called the "harrowing of hell," the deliverance of the spirits in prison.[u] In Do Best Piers Ploughman appears as a

[t] It is added—

"For wise men ben holden
To Purchase you Pardon and the Popes bulles,
At the Dreadful Doom when the Dead shall arise,
And Come all before Christ, acCounts to yield
How thou Leddest thy Life here, and his Laws kept. * * * *
A Pouch full of Pardons there, nor Provincials Letters,
Though ye be Found in the Fraternity of all the Four Orders,
And have InDulgences Double fold, if Do Wel you help,
I set your Patents and your Pardons at one Pisa worth."—Wright, i. p. 150.

[u] It is odd that Mahamet (Mahomet) defends the realm of Lucifer against the Lord with guns and mangonels—a whimsical anticipation of Milton. "There had been a loud cry, Lift up your heads, ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors." At length,

"What Lord art thou? quoth Lucifer. A voice aLoud said,
The Lord of Might and of Heaven, that Made all things,
Duke of this Dim place. Anon unDo the gates
That Christ may comen in, the King's son of heaven.
And with that Break Hell Brake, with all Belial's Bars,
Nor any Wight or Ward Wide opened the gates.
Patriarchs and Prophets, Populus in tenebris,
Sang out with Saint John, Ecce Agnus Dei."

I am

kind of impersonation of the Saviour, or of his faith; the Holy Ghost descends upon him in lightning; Grace arrays him with wonderful power to sustain the war with coming Antichrist; Piety has bestowed upon him four stout oxen (the Evangelists) to till the earth; four bullocks to harrow the land (the four Latin Fathers), who harrow into it the Old and New Testaments; the grain which Piers sows is the cardinal virtues. The poem concludes with the resurrection and war of Antichrist, in which Piers, if victor, is hardly victor—"a cold and comfortless conclusion," says the learned editor, Dr. Whitaker. I am persuaded that it is not the actual or the designed conclusion. The last Passage of Do Best can hardly have been intended to be so much shorter than the others. The poet may have broken off indeed in sad despondency, and left his design unfinished; he may have been prevented from its completion; or, what is far less improbable, considering the way in which the Poem has succeeded, the end may have been lost.

The Poet who could address such opinions, though wrapt up in prudent allegory, to the popular ear, to the ear of the peasantry of England; the people who could listen with delight to such strains, were far advanced towards a revolt from Latin Christianity. Truth, true religion, was not to be found with, it was not known by, Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Clergy, Monks, Friars. It was to be sought by man himself, by the individual man, by the poorest man, under the sole guidance of Reason, Conscience, and of the Grace of God, vouchsafed directly, not through any intermediate human being, or even Sacrament, to the self-directing soul. If it yet respected all existing doctrines, it respected them not as resting on traditional or sacerdotal authority. There is a manifest appeal through-

I am tempted to give the close of this canto—so characteristic of the poem. He had said in Latin, Mercy and Charity have met together; Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other:—

"Truth Trumpeted them, and sung 'Te Deum laudamus,'
And then saLuted Love, in a Loud note,
Ecce quam bonum et quam jocundum est habitare fratres in unum.
Till the Day Dawned, there Damsels Daunsed,
That men Rang to the Resurrection. And with that I awaked,
And called Kitty my wife, and Kalotte my daughter,
A Rise and go Reverence Gods Resurrection,
And Creep on knees to the Cross, and Kiss it for a jewel,
And Rightfullest of Reliques, none Richer on earth,
For Gods Blessed Body it Bare for our Bote (good).
And it a Feareth the Fiend; for such is the might,
May no Grisly Ghost Glide where it shadoweth."

out, an unconscious installation of Scripture alone,[x] as the ultimate judge; the test of everything is a moral and purely religious one, its agreement with holiness and charity.

English prose in Wycliffe's Bible, the higher English poetry in its true father, Chaucer, maintained this prevailing and dominant Teutonism. Wycliffe's Bible, as translated from the Vulgate, had not so entirely shaken off the trammels of Latinity as our later versions; but this first bold assertion of Teutonic independence immeasurably strengthened, even in its language, that independence. It tasked the language, as it were, to its utmost vigour, copiousness, and flexibility; and by thus putting it to the trial, forced out all those latent and undeveloped qualities. It was constantly striving to be English, and by striving became so more and more. Compare the freedom and versatility of Wycliffe's Bible with Wycliffe's Tracts. Wycliffe has not only advanced in the knowledge of purer and more free religion, he is becoming a master of purer and more free English.

Geoffrey Chaucer, among the most remarkable of poets, was in nothing more remarkable than in being most emphatically an English poet. Chaucer lived in courts and castles: he was in the service of the King, he was a retainer of the great Duke of Lancaster. In the court and in the castle, no doubt, if anywhere, with the Norman chivalrous magnificence lingered whatever remained of Norman manners and language. Chaucer had served in the armies of King Edward III.; he had seen almost all the more flourishing countries, many of the great cities, of the Continent, of Flanders, France, Italy. It may be but a romantic tradition, that at the wedding of Violante to the great Duke of Milan he had seen Petrarch, perhaps Boccaccio, and that Froissart too was present at that splendid festival. It may be but a groundless inference

[x] "And is Run to Religion, and hath Rendered the Bible,
And Preacheth to the People St. Paul's words."—Wright, p. 156.

He quotes, "Ye suffer fools gladly" (1 Cor.). Is this Wickliff? Clergy (Theology) weds a wife; her name is Scripture.—Wright, p. 182. I take the opportunity of observing that the famous prophecy, ascribed to Langland, about the King who should suppress the monasteries, is merely a vague and general prediction; though the naming the Abbot of Abingdon is a lucky coincidence.—See Wright, p. 192.

from a misinterpreted passage in his poems, that he had conversed with Petrarch (November, 1372); but there is unquestionable evidence that Chaucer was at Genoa under a commission from the Crown. He visited brilliant Florence, perhaps others of the noble cities of Italy. Five years later he was in Flanders and at Paris. In 1378 he went with the Embassy to demand the hand of a French Princess for the young Richard of Bourdeaux. Still later he was at the gorgeous court of the Visconti at Milan.[y] Chaucer was master of the whole range of vernacular poetry, which was bursting forth in such young and prodigal vigour, in the languages born from the Romance Latin. He had read Dante, he had read Petrarch; to Boccaccio he owed the groundwork of two of his best poems—the Knight's Tale of Palamon and Arcite and Griselidis. I cannot but think that he was familiar with the Troubadour poetry of the Langue d'Oc; of the Langue d'Oil, he knew well the knightly tales of the Trouvères and the Fabliaux, as well as the later allegorical school, which was then in the height of its fashion in Paris. He translated the Romance of the Rose.

It is indeed extraordinary to see the whole of the mediæval, or post-mediæval poetry (with the great exception of the Dantesque vision of the other world) summed up, and as it were represented by Chaucer in one or more perfect examples, and so offered to the English people. There is the legend of martyrdom in Constance of Surrie; the miracle legend, not without its harsh alloy of hatred to the unbeliever, in Hugh of Lincoln; the wild, strange, stirring adventures told in the free prolix Epopee of the Trouvère, in its romanticised classic form, in Troilus and Cressida; in the wilder Oriental strain of magic and glamour in the half-told tale of Cambuscan; the chivalrous in Palamon and Arcite; to which perhaps may be added the noble Franklin's Tale. There is the Fabliau in its best, in its tender and graceful form, in Griselidis; in its gayer and more licentious, in January and May; in its coarser, more broadly humorous, and, to our finer manners, repulsive, Miller's Tale; and in that of the Reve. The

[y] Compare the lives of Chaucer, especially the latest by Sir Harris Nicolas.

unfinished Sir Thopas might seem as if the spirit of Ariosto or Cervantes, or of lighter or later poets, was struggling for precocious being. There is the genial apologue of the Cock and the Fox, which might seem an episode from the universal brute Epic, the Latin, or Flemish, or German or French Reynard. The more cumbrous and sustained French allegory appears in the translation of the Romaunt of the Rose; the more rich and simple in the Temple of Fame. There are a few slighter pieces which may call to mind the Lais and Serventes of the South.

Yet all the while Chaucer in thought, in character, in language, is English—resolutely, determinately, almost boastfully English.[z] The creation of native poetry was his deliberate aim; and already that broad, practical, humorous yet serious view of life, of life in its infinite variety, that which reaches its height in Shakspeare, has begun to reveal itself in Chaucer. The Canterbury Tales, even in the Preface, represent, as in a moving comedy, the whole social state of the times; they display human character in action as in speech; and that character is the man himself, the whole man, with all his mingling, shifting, crossing, contradictory passions, motives, peculiarities, his greatnesses and weaknesses, his virtues and his vanities; every one is perfectly human, yet every one the individual man, the very dress, gesture, look, speech, tone of the individual. There is an example of every order and class of society, high, low, secular, religious. As yet each is distinct in his class, as his class from others. Contrast Chaucer's pilgrims with the youths and damsels of Boccaccio. Exquisitely as these are drawn, and in some respects finely touched, they are all of one gay light class; almost any one might tell any tale with equal propriety; they differ in name, in nothing else.

In his religious characters, if not in his religious tales (religion is still man's dominant motive), Chaucer is by no

[z] There is a curious passage in the Prologue to the Testament of Love on the soveran wits in Latin and in French. "Let then Clerkes enditen in Latin, for they have the propertie of science, and the knowledge in that facultie; and let Frenchmen in their French also enditen their quaint termes, for it is kindely to their mouthes; and let us shew our fantasies in such wordes as wee learneden of our dames tongue."—Fol. 271.

means the least happy. In that which is purely religious the poet himself is profoundly religious; in his Prayer to the Virgin, written for the Duchess Blanche of Lancaster, for whom also he poured forth his sad elegy; in his Gentle Martyrs S. Constantia and S. Cecilia: he is not without his touch of bigotry, as has been said, in Hugh of Lincoln. But the strong Teutonic good sense of Chaucer had looked more deeply into the whole monastic and sacerdotal system. His wisdom betrays itself in his most mirthful, as in his coarsest humour. He who drew the Monk, the Pardoner, the Friar Limitour, the Summoner, had seen far more than the outer form, the worldliness of the Churchman, the abuse of indulgences, the extortions of the friars, the licentiousness of the Ecclesiastical Courts, of the Ecclesiastics themselves: he had penetrated into the inner depths of the religion. Yet his wisdom, even in his most biting passages, is tempered with charity. Though every order, the Abbot, the Prioress, the Friar, the Pardoner, the Summoner, is impersonated to the life, with all their weaknesses, follies, affectations, even vices and falsehoods, in unsparing freedom, in fearless truth, yet none, or hardly one, is absolutely odious; the jolly hunting Abbot, with his dainty horses, their bridles jingling in the wind, his greyhounds, his bald shining head, his portly person, his hood fastened with a rich pin in a love-knot: the tender and delicate Prioress, with what we should now call her sentimentality, virtuous no doubt, but with her broad and somewhat suspicious motto about all-conquering love: the Friar, who so sweetly heard confession, and gave such pleasant absolution, urging men, instead of weeping and prayers, to give silver to the friars; with his lisping voice and twinkling eyes, yet the best beggar in his house, to whom the poorest widow could not deny a farthing: the Pardoner with his wallet in his lap, brimful of pardons from Rome, with his reliques or pillow-bere covered with part of our Lady's veil and the glass vessel with pig's bones: yet in Church the Pardoner was a noble Ecclesiast, read well, chanted with such moving tones, that no one could resist him and not throw silver into the offertory. The Summoner, whose office and the Arch-

deacon's Court in which he officiated seem to have been most unpopular, is drawn in the darkest colours, with his fire-red cherubim's face, lecherous, venal, licentious. Above all, the Parish Priest of Chaucer has thrown off Roman mediæval Sacerdotalism; he feels his proper place; he arrays himself only in the virtues which are the essence of his holy function. This unrivalled picture is the most powerful because the most quiet, uninsulting, unexasperating satire. Chaucer's Parish Priest might have been drawn from Wycliffe, from Wycliffe at Lutterworth, not at Oxford, from Wycliffe, not the fierce controversialist, but the affectionate and beloved teacher of his humble flock. The Priest's Tale is a sermon, prolix indeed, but, except in urging confession and holding up the confessorial office of the Priesthood, purely and altogether moral in its scope and language.[a] The translation of the Romaunt of the Rose, with all its unmitigated bitterness against the Friars, is a further illustration of the religious mind of Chaucer. If we could interpret with any certainty the allegory and the mystic and poetic prose in the Testament of Love, we might hope for more light on the religion and on the later period of Chaucer's life.[b] It is evident that at that time, towards the close of his life, he was in disgrace and in prison. Other documents show that his pensions or allowances from the Crown were, for a time at least, withdrawn. There is no doubt that his imprisonment arose out of some turbulent and popular movements in the City of London. There is every probability that these movements were connected with the struggle to reinvest the Wycliffite (and so long as the Lancastrian party was Wycliffite) Lancastrian Mayor,[c] John of Northampton in

[a] I have little doubt that in the Retractation ascribed to Chaucer at the close of this Sermon, Tyrwhitt is right in that part which he marks for interpolation. Read the passage without it, all is clear.

[b] Speght in his argument to the Testament of Love, if it be Speght's. "Chaucer did compile this booke as a comfort to himselfe after great greefes conceived for some rash attempts of the Commons, with which hee had joyned, and thereby was in feare to lose the favour of his best friends."—Fol. 272.

[c] See the whole very curious but obscure passage, fol. 277: "Then, Lady, I thought that every man that by anye way of right, rightfully done, may helpe any commune (helpe) to been saved." Chaucer was in the secrets of his party, which he was urged to betray. He goes on to speak of the "citie of London, which is to me so deare and sweet, in which I was forth growne; and more kindly love have I to that place than to anye other in yearth."

the civic dignity. The Londoners were Lollards, and if on the people's side, Chaucer was on the Lollards' side. Chaucer, in his imprisonment, would, like Boethius of old, from whom the Testament of Love was imitated, seek consolation, but his consolation is in religion, not philosophy. His aspiration is after the beautiful and all-excelling Margarita, the pearl of great price, who, like the Beatrice of Dante, seems at once an ideal or idealised mistress, and the impersonation of pure religion. Love alone can bestow on him this precious boon; and divine love, as usual, borrowing some of its imagery and language from human love, purifies and exalts the soul of the poet for this great blessing by imparting the knowledge of God in the works of his power, and the works of his grace and glory. More than this the obstinate obscurity of the allegory refuses to reveal.

We must turn again to Germany, which we left in its intermediate state of slowly dawning Teutonism. Germany, it has been seen, rejected the first free movement of her kindred Teutons in England, because it was taken up with such passionate zeal by the hostile Sclavonians. The reformation in Bohemia, followed by its wild and cruel wars, civil and foreign, threw back the German mind in aversion and terror upon Latin Christianity. Yet Teutonism only slumbered, it was not extinguished; it was too deeply rooted; it had been slowly growing up from its undying root for centuries. The strife of ages between the Emperor and the Pope could not but leave a profound jealousy, and even antipathy, in a great mass of the nation. Throughout there had been a strong Imperialist, a German faction. The haughty aggression of John XXII. (a Pontiff not on the Papal throne at Rome) was felt as a mere wanton and unprovoked insult. It was not now the Pope asserting against the Emperor the independence of Italy or of Rome; not defending Rome and Italy from the aggression of Transalpine barbarians by carrying the war against the Emperor into Germany. Louis of Bavaria would never have descended into Italy if the Pope had left him in peace on his own side of the Alps. The shame of Germany at the pusillanimity of Louis of Bavaria wrought more strongly on German

pride: the Pope was more profoundly hated for the self-sought humiliation of the Emperor. At the same time the rise of the great and wealthy commercial cities had raised a new class with higher aspirations for freedom than their turbulent princes and nobles, who were constantly in league with the Pope against the Emperor, of whom they were more jealous than of the Pope; or the Prince Bishops, who would set up a hierarchical instead of a papal supremacy. The burghers, often hostile to their Bishops, and even to the cathedral Chapters, with whom they were at strife for power and jurisdiction in their towns, seized perpetually the excuse of their papalising to eject their Prelates, and to erect their lower Clergy into a kind of spiritual Republic. The Schism had prostrated the Pope before the temporal power; the Emperor of Germany had compelled the Pope to summon a Council; at that Council he had taken the acknowledged lead, had almost himself deposed a Pope. It is true that at the close he had been out-manœuvred by the subtle and pertinacious Churchman; Martin V. had regained the lost ground; a barren, ambiguous, delusive Concordat had baffled the peremptory demand of Germany for a reformation of the Church in its head and in its members.[d] Yet even at the height of the Bohemian war, dark, deepening murmurs were heard of German cities, German Princes joining the Antipapal movement. During the Council of Basle, when Latin Christianity was severed into two oppugnant parties, that of the Pope Eugenius IV. and that of the Transalpine reforming hierarchy, Germany had stood aloof in cold, proud neutrality: but for the subtle policy of one man, Æneas Sylvius, the weak and yielding flexibility of another, the Emperor Frederick III., there might have been a German spiritual nationality, a German independent Church. The Pope was compelled to the humiliation of restoring the Prelate Electors whom he had

[d] Ranke has written thus (I should not quote in English, if the English were not Mrs. Austin's): "Had this course been persevered in with union and constancy, the German Catholic Church, established in so many great principalities, and splendidly provided with the most munificent endowments, would have acquired a perfectly independent position, in which she might have resisted the subsequent political storms with as much firmness as England."—Reformation in Germany, vol. i. p. 48.

dared to degrade, to degrade their successors whom he had appointed. Gregory of Heimberg, the representative of the German mind, had defied the Roman Court in Rome itself, had denounced Papal haughtiness to the face of the Pope.[c] But for one event, all the policy of Æneas Sylvius, and all the subserviency of Frederick III. to him who he supposed was his counsellor, but who was his ruler, had been unavailing. As the aggressive crusade to Palestine gave the dominion of Latin Christendom to the older Popes, so the defensive crusade against the terrible progress of the Turk, which threatened both Teutonic and Latin Christendom, placed the Pope again at the head, not in arms, but in awe and influence, of the whole West. Germany and the Pope were in common peril, they were compelled to close alliance. In justice to Æneas Sylvius, when Pius II., it may be acknowledged that it was his providential sagacity, his not ungrounded apprehension of the greatness of the danger, which made him devote his whole soul to the league against the Ottoman; if it was also wise policy, as distracting the German mind from dangerous meditations of independence, this even with Pius II. was but a secondary and subordinate consideration. The Turk was the cause of the truce of more than half a century between the Papacy and the Empire.

But throughout all that time the silent growth of the German languages, the independent Teutonic thought expressed in poetry, even in preaching, was widening the alienation. During the century and a half in which English Teutonism was resolutely bracing itself to practical and political religious independence, and the English language ripening to its masculine force, with the Anglo-Saxon successfully wrestling for the mastery against the Southern Latin; in Germany a silent rebellious mysticism was growing up even in her cloisters, and working into the depths of men's hearts and minds. The movement was more profound, more secret, and unconscious even among those most powerfully under its influence. There was not only the open insurrection of Marsilio of Padua and William of Ockham against the Papal or hierarchical au-

[c] Ranke, p. 49. Compare these passages above.

thority, and the wild revolt of the Fraticelli; there was likewise at once an acknowledgment of and an attempt to satisfy that yearning of the religious soul for what the Church, the Latin Church, had ceased to supply, which was no longer to be found in the common cloister life, which the new Orders had ceased to administer to the wants of the people. During this time, too, while Germany luxuriated in the Romance Legend, as well as in the chivalrous Romance, and the hymn still in some degree vied with the Lay of the Minnesinger, German prose had grown up and was still growing up out of vernacular preaching. From the earliest period some scanty instruction, catechetical or oral, from the glosses or from fragments of the Scripture, had been communicated in German to the people: some German homilies, translated from the Latin, had been in use. But the great impulse was given by the new Orders. The Dominican Conrad of Marburg had been forced at times to leave the overcrowded church for the open air, on account of the multitudes which gathered round the fierce Inquisitor, to hear his sermons, to witness the conclusion of his sermons, the burning of a holocaust of heretics. Far different was the tone of the Franciscan Bertholdt of Winterthur,[f] who from 1242 to 1272 preached with amazing success throughout Bavaria, Austria, Moravia, Thuringia. His sermons, taken down by the zeal of his hearers, were popular in the best sense; he had the instinct of eloquence; he is even now by the best judges set above Tauler himself. In earnestness, in energy, in his living imagery from external nature, Bertholdt was the popular preacher in the open field, on the hill-side, Tauler the contemplative monk in the pulpit of the cloister-chapel.[g] Nor did Bertholdt stand alone in these vivid popular addresses. That which, notwithstanding these examples, was at least inefficiently bestowed by the Church, stirring and awakening vernacular instruction,

German preaching.

Bertholdt.

[f] Compare Leyser, Einleitung. Deutsche Predigten des viii. und xiv. Jahrhundert, Quedlinburg, 1838, p. xvi., for the life of Bertholdt. Gervinus (Deutsche Poesie) writes, "Die Vortrefflichkeit der Berthold'schen Predigten, die weit die Schriften Taulers übertrifft."—Vol. ii. p. 142. Schmidt, Joannes Tauler, p. 82.

[g] Leyser, Deutsche Predigten.

was prodigally poured forth from other quarters. The dissidents under their various names, and the Beghards, were everywhere. At the beginning of the fourteenth century Alsace was almost in possession of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit; they were driven out and scattered, but expulsion and dispersion, if it does not multiply the numbers, usually increases the force and power of such communities.[h] Mysticism within the Church strove to fill the void caused by their expulsion. Of these mystics the most famous names are Rysbroeck of Cologne, Master Eckhart, John Tauler, Nicolas of Suso. The life of Tauler will show us the times and the personal influence of these men, and that of their opinions. It occupies all the early part of the fourteenth century.

John Tauler[i] was born in Strasburg in 1290. At the age of eighteen the religious youth entered the Dominican cloister. He went to study at Paris; but at Paris the Doctors were ever turning over the leaves of huge books, they cared not for the one book of life.[k] Probably on his return to Strasburg he came under the influence of Master Eckhart. This remarkable man preached in German; countless hearers thronged even to Eckhart's vernacular sermons. But Eckhart was a Schoolman in the incongruous office of a popular preacher; he was more than a Schoolman, he aspired to be a philosopher. His was not a passionate, simple, fervent theology, but the mystic divinity of Dionysius the Areopagite; it approached the Arabic Aristotelian philosophy. He held, indeed, the Creation out of nothing, and in theory repudiated the Eternity of Matter; but Creation seemed a necessity of the divine nature. The Universal could not but be particular; so God was all things, and all things were God. The soul came forth from God, it was an emanation; it had part of the light of God, in itself inextinguishable, but that light required kindling and quickening by divine grace.[m] Thus man stands between the spiritual and the

[h] Schmidt, Tauler, p. 7. In 1317, there was a violent persecution by John of Ochsenstein, Bishop of Strasburg.

[i] Joannes Tauler von Strasburg, von D. Carl Schmidt. Hamburg, 1841.

[k] Tauler, p. 3. Quotation from Tauler's Sermon in note.

[m] See the Chapter on Eckhart. Ritter, Christliche Philosophie, iv. p. 498, &c. "Eckhart ist mit den Theologen seiner

corporeal, between time and eternity. God will reveal himself fully, pour himself wholly into the reasonable soul of man. It is not by love but by intelligence that the mystic reunion takes place with God; by knowledge we are one with God; that which knows and that which is known are one. Master Eckhart is the parent of German metaphysical theology. But if Tauler was caught with the glowing language in which Eckhart clothed these colder opinions, he stood aloof from the kindred teaching of the Beghards, with their more passionate, more religious Pantheism—the same in thought with Eckhart, more bold and fearless in expression.

But if of itself the soul of Tauler sought a deeper and more fervent faith, the dark and turbulent times would isolate or make such a soul seek its sympathy within a narrower circle. It was the height of the war between John XXII. and Louis of Bavaria, and nowhere did that war rage more violently than in Strasburg. The Bishop John of Ochsenstein was for the Pope, the Magistrates, the people, for the Emperor, or rather for insulted Germany. The Bishop laid his interdict on the city; the Magistrates, the Town Council, declared that the Clergy who would not perform their functions must be driven from the city.[n] The Clergy, the Monks, the Friars, were divided: here the bells were silent, the churches closed; there they tolled for prayers, and the contumacious Clergy performed forbidden services. No wonder that religious men sought that religion in themselves, which they found not in the church or in the cloister; they took refuge in the sanctuary of their own thoughts, from the religion which was contesting the world. In all the great cities rose a secret unorganised brotherhood, bound together only by silent infelt sympathies, the Friends of God. This appellation was a secession, a tacit revolt, an assumption of superiority. God was not to be worshipped in the church

Zeit von der Ueberzeugung durchdrungen, dass die vernunftige Seele des Menschen dazu bestimmt sei in der innigsten verbindung mit Gott, des höchsten Gutes, ganz und ohne alle Schmälerung, theilhaftig zu werden . . . Gott soll sich ganz offenbaren, wir ihn ganz erkennen: er soll ganz unser werden."—P. 502.

[n] "Do soltent su ouch fúrbas singen,
Oder aber us der statt springen."
—*Königshofen Chronicle*, 128-9. Schmidt, p. 14.

See vol. v. c. 7.

alone, with the Clergy alone, with the Monks alone, in the Ritual; even in the Sacraments; he was within, in the heart, in the life. This and kindred brotherhoods embraced all orders, Priests, Monks, Friars, Nobles, Burghers, Peasants; they had their Prophets and Prophetesses, above all, their Preachers.° Some convents were entirely in their power. In one thing alone they sided with the Town Councils—in denouncing the unlawfulness, the wickedness of closing the churches against the poor; they rejected the monstrous doctrine that the Pope and the Bishops might withhold the blessings of religion from the many for the sins, or what they chose to call the sins, of the few. Christian love was something higher, holier than Bishop or than Pope. John Tauler was an earnest disciple, a powerful apostle of this lofty mysticism; he preached with wonderful success in Strasburg, in some of the neighbouring convents, in towns and villages, in the cities. He journeyed even to Cologne, the seat of this high mysticism; there the famous Rysbroeck taught with the utmost power and popularity. Tauler was often at Basle, where Henry of Nordlingen, who had respected the Papal interdict at Constance, resumed his forbidden functions. Tauler threw aside all scholastic subtleties; he strove to be plain, simple, comprehensible to the humblest understanding; he preached in German, but still with deferential citations in Latin. Tauler sought no Papal licence; it was his mission, it was his imperative duty as a Priest, to preach the Gospel.

But Tauler was to undergo a sterner trial, to be trained in another school. In Basle he had been marked by men of a different cast, the gauge of his mind had been taken, the depth of his heart sounded, his religion weighed and found wanting. In Strasburg appeared a stranger who five times sat at the feet of Tauler, and listened to his preaching with serious, searching earnestness. He was a layman, he sought an interview with Tauler, confessed to him, received the Sacrament at his hands. He then expressed his wish that Tauler would preach how man could attain perfection, that perfection to which he might aspire on earth. Tauler

° On the "Friends of God," see Schmidt, Anhang.

preached his loftiest mysticism. The stern man now spoke with authority, the authority of a more determinate will, and more firm convictions. "Thou art yet in slavery to the letter; thou knowest not the life-giving spirit; thou art but a Pharisee; thou trustest in thine own power, in thine own learning; thou thinkest that thou seekest God's honour, and seekest thine own." Tauler shuddered. "Never man before reproved me for my sins." He felt the spell of a master. "Twelve years," said the layman (who was rebuking the self-righteousness of Tauler!) "I have been toiling to the height of spiritual perfection, which I have now attained, by the study of German works, by self-mortification and chastisements which have now ceased to be necessary." He gave Tauler certain simple moral rules, counselled him to preach no more, to hear no more confession, to deny himself, and to meditate on the life and death of Christ, till he had attained humility and regeneration.[p] The stronger, the more positive and peremptory mind subdued the gentler. Tauler, for above two years, despite the wonder of his friends, the taunts of his enemies, was silent. The first time, at the end of that period, when he attempted, under permission (for A.D. 1340. the inflexible layman watched him unceasingly), he broke down in floods of tears. This stranger was a Waldensian, Nicolas of Basle. The secret influence of these teachers, unsuppressed by years of persecution, may appear from the work thus wrought on the mind of Tauler, and from the fact that it was not till towards the close of the century, long after Tauler's death, that Nicolas of Basle, venturing into France, was seized and burned as a heretic at Poitiers.

Tauler adhered to the Church; many of the Waldenses did so to escape persecution,[q] and to infuse their own zeal; Tauler, it seems, in honesty and simplicity. But from that time the German preaching of Tauler—now unmingled with Latin, in churches, in private assem-

[p] D. Karl Schmidt has taken the whole of this from an old narrative "of a Teacher of Holy Scripture and a Layman," of which he does not doubt the authenticity.

[q] "Auf diese Weise die Waldenser in die Kirche selber Eingang fanden und auf die berühmtesten Doctoren und namlich auf Dominicaner, deren Beruf es war die Ketzer zu bekämpfen, so mächtig wirkten."—Schmidt, p. 37.

blies, in the houses of Beguines, in nunneries—was more plain, earnest, and as usual, flowed from his own heart to the hearts of others. He taught estrangement from the world, self-denial, poverty of spirit, not merely passive surrender of the soul to God, but, with this, love also to the brethren and the discharge of the duties of life.[r] Men were to seek peace, during these turbulent times, within their own souls. He not only preached in German, he published in German, "the following the lowly life of Christ." The black plague fell on the city of Strasburg, on Strasburg still under the ban of the Pope. In Strasburg died 16,000, in Basle 14,000 victims. Amid these terrible times of wild visions, wild processions of self-scourged penitents, of crowded cloisters, massacred Jews, the calm voice of Tauler, and of some who spoke and wrote in the spirit of Tauler, rose against the unpitying Church. A remonstrance was addressed to the Clergy, that the poor, innocent, blameless people were left to die untended, unabsolved, under the interdict, and boldly condemning the Priests who refused them the last consolations of the Gospel.[s] "Christ died for all men; the Pope cannot, by his interdict, close heaven against those who die innocent." In another writing the abuse of the spiritual sword was clearly denounced, the rights of the Electors asserted. The broad maxim was laid down, that "he who confesses the true faith of Christ, and sins only against the person of the Pope, is no heretic." It is said that the people took comfort, and died in peace, though under the Papal interdict. It was for these unforgiven opinions that Tauler and his friends, Thomas of Strasburg, an Augustinian, and Ludolph of Saxony, first a Dominican then a Carthusian, fell under the suspicion of the new Bishop Bertholdt and the Clergy. He had been called to render an account of his faith before Charles IV., "the Priests' Emperor," when at Strasburg. The Mystics were commanded to recant, and to withdraw from their writings these obnoxious tenets.

A.D. 1348-9.

A.D. 1348.

Tauler disappeared from Strasburg; he was now heard

[r] Der Nachfolgung des armen Leben s. Christi.
[s] Schmidt, Tauler, p. 52.

in Cologne; there he taught his own simpler doctrines, and protested against the Pantheistic tenets of the Beghards, and even of those dreamy fanatics who would yield up their passive souls to the working of Divine grace. He returned to Strasburg only to die. His last hours were passed in the garden of the convent in which his only sister had long dwelt, a holy and blameless nun. He sought her gentle aid and consolation. One hard Mystic reproached his weakness in yielding to this last earthly affection. He was buried in the cloisters, amid the respectful sorrow of the whole city. A.D. 1361.

Tauler had been dead nearly a century before the close of our History, but his Sermons lived in the memory of men; they were transcribed with pious solicitude, and disseminated among all who sought something beyond what was taught in the Church, or taught by the Clergy; that which the Ritual, performed perhaps by a careless, proud, or profligate Priest, did not suggest; which was not heard in the cold and formal Confessional; which man might learn for himself, teach to himself, which brought the soul in direct relation with God, trained it to perfection, to communion, to assimilation, to unity with God. Herder, perhaps the wisest of German critics, condemns the Sermons of Tauler for their monotony:[t] "He who has read two of Tauler's Sermons has read all."[u] But perhaps in that monotony lay much of their strength. Religious men seek not variety but emotion; it is the key-note which vibrates to the heart. Tauler had Mysticism enough to awaken and keep alive all the most passionate sentiments of religion, yet with a seeming clearness and distinctness as if addressed to the reason; his preaching appeared at least to be intelligible; it addressed the whole man, his imagination, his reason, his affections.

But Tauler's Mysticism was far beyond the sublime selfishness of the Imitation of Christ: it embraced fully, explicitly, the love of others; it resembled the Imitation of à Kempis, in that it was absolutely and entirely personal religion,

[t] The two latter parts of Dr. Schmidt's extracts. Tauler are on the writings and doctrines of Tauler, illustrated with abundant

[u] Theologische Briefe 41, quoted by Schmidt, p. 84.

self-wrought out, self-disciplined, self-matured, with nothing necessarily intermediate between the grace of God and the soul of man. The man might be perfect in spirit and in truth within himself, spiritualised only by the Holy Spirit. Tauler's perfect man was a social being, not a hermit; his goodness spread on earth, it was not all drawn up to heaven. Though the perfect man might not rise above duties, he might rise above observances; though never free from the law of love to his fellow-creatures, he claimed a dangerous freedom as regarded the law and usage of the Church, and dependence on the ministers of the Church. Those who were content with ritual observances, however obedient, were still imperfect; outward rites, fastings, were good as means, but the soul must liberate itself from all these outward means. The soul, having discharged all this, must still await in patience something higher, something to which all this is but secondary, inferior; having attained perfection, it may cast all these things away as unnecessary. Tauler's disciple respects the laws of the Church because they are the laws of the Church; he does not willingly break them, but he is often accused of breaking them when intent on higher objects. But the whole vital real work in man is within. Penance is nought without contrition: "Mortify not the poor flesh, but mortify sin." Man must confess to God; unless man forsakes sin, the absolution of Pope and Cardinals is of no effect; the Confessor has no power over sin. Tauler's religion is still more inflexibly personal: "His own works make not a man holy, how can those of others? Will God regard the rich man who buys for a pitiful sum the prayers of the poor? Not the intercession of the Virgin, nor of all the Saints, can profit the unrepentant sinner."

All this, if not rebellion, was sowing the seeds of rebellion against the sacerdotal domination; if it was not the proclamation, it was the secret murmur preparatory for the assertion of Teutonic independence.

Tauler lived not only in his writings; the cherished treasure of Mysticism was handed down by minds of kindred spirit for nearly two centuries. When they were appealed to by Luther as the harbingers of his own more

profound and powerful religiousness; the Friends of God subsisted, if not organised, yet maintaining visibly if not publicly their succession of Apostolic holiness.

Ten years after the death of Tauler, Nicolas of Basle, not yet having ventured on his fatal mission into France, is addressing a long and pious monition to the Brethren of St. John in Strasburg.[x]

Near the close of the century, Martin, a Monk, was arraigned at Cologne as an infatuated disciple of Nicolas of Basle.[y] From this process it appears that many Friends of God had been recently burned at Heidelberg.[z] The heresies with which Martin is charged are obviously misconceptions, if not misrepresentations, of the doctrine of perfection taught by Tauler and by most of the German Mystics.

Tauler was thus only one of the voices, if the most powerful and influential, which as it were appealed directly to God from the Pope and the Hierarchy; which asserted a higher religion than that of the Church; which made salvation dependent on personal belief and holiness, not on obedience to the Priest; which endeavoured to renew the long-dissolved wedlock between Christian faith and Christian morality; and tacitly at least, if not inferentially, admitted the great Wycliffite doctrine, that the bad Pope, the bad Bishop, the bad Priest, was neither Pope, Bishop, nor Priest. It was an appeal to God, and also to the moral sense of man; and throughout this period of nearly two centuries which elapsed before the appearance of Luther, this inextinguishable torch passed from hand to hand, from generation to generation. Its influence was seen in the earnest demand for Reformation by the

[x] Schmidt, Anhang 5, p. 233, dated 1377.

[y] "Quod quidam Laicus nomine Nicolaus de Basilea, cui te funditus submisisti, clarius et perfectius evangelium quam aliqui Apostoli, et beatus Paulus hoc intellexerit .... quod prædicto Nicolao ex perfectione submissionis sibi facta contra præcepta cujuscunque Prælati etiam Papæ licite et sine peccato obedire."—He was accused of having said, That he was restored to his state of primitive innocence, emancipated from obedience of the Church, with full liberty to preach and administer the Sacraments without licence of the Church. Of course the charge was darkened into the grossest Antinomianism.

[z] 1393. "Quod judicialiter convicti et per ecclesiam condempnati ac impenitentes heretici aliquando in Heidelberga concremati fuerunt et sunt *amici Dei*."—Anhang 6, p. 238.

Councils; the sullen estrangement, notwithstanding the reunion to the sacerdotal yoke, during the Hussite wars; the disdainful neutrality when reformation by the Councils seemed hopeless; it is seen in the remarkable book, the "German Theology," attributed by Luther to Tauler himself, but doubtless of a later period.[a] Ruder and coarser works, in all the jarring and various dialects, betrayed the German impatience, the honest but homely popular alienation from ecclesiastical dominion, and darkly foreshowed that when the irresistible Revolution should come, it would be more popular, more violent, more irreconcileable.

[a] Two translations have recently appeared in England of this book, of which the real character and importance cannot be appreciated without a full knowledge of the time at which it originally appeared. It was not so much what it taught as "German Theology," but what it threw aside, as no part of genuine Christian Faith.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

LITERATURE was thus bursting loose from Latin Christianity; it had left the cloister to converse with men of the world; it had ceased to be the prerogative of the Hierarchy, and had begun to expatiate in new regions. In Italy erelong, as in its classical studies, so in the new Platonism of Marsilius Ficinus and the Florentine school, it almost threatened to undermine Christianity, or left a Christianity which might almost have won the assent of the Emperor Julian. In all the Teutonic races it had begun to assert its freedom from sacerdotal authority; its poets, even its preachers, were all but in revolt.

But Art was more faithful to her munificent patron, her bold and prolific creator, her devout worshipper. Of all the arts Architecture was that which owed the most glorious triumphs to Christianity. Architecture must still be the slave of wealth and power, for majestic, durable, and costly buildings can arise only at their command; and wealth and power were still to a great extent in the hands of the Hierarchy. The first sign and prophetic omen of the coming revolution was when in the rich commercial cities the town halls began to vie in splendour with the Churches and Monasteries. Yet nobler gratitude, if such incentive were possible, might attach Architecture to the cause of the Church. Under the Church she had perfected old forms, invented new; she had risen to an unrivalled majesty of design and skill in construction. In her stateliness, solemnity, richness, boldness, variety, vastness, solidity, she might compete with the whole elder world, and might almost defy future ages.

Architecture faithful to the Church.

Latin Christianity, during a period of from ten to twelve centuries, had covered the whole of Western Europe with its still multiplying Churches and religious buildings. From the Southern shores of Sicily

Churches in Latin Christendom.

to the Hebrides and the Scandinavian kingdoms, from the doubtful borders of Christian Spain to Hungary, Poland, Prussia, not a city was without its Cathedral, surrounded by its succursal churches, its monasteries, and convents, each with its separate church or chapel. There was not a town but above the lowly houses, almost entirely of wood, rose the churches of stone, or some other solid material, in their superior dignity, strength, dimensions, and height; not a village was without its sacred edifice: no way-side without its humbler chapel or oratory. Not a river but in its course reflected the towers and pinnacles of many abbeys; not a forest but above its lofty oaks or pines appeared the long-ridged roof, or the countless turrets of the conventual church and buildings. Even now, after periods in some countries of rude religious fanaticism, in one, France (next to Italy, or equally with Italy prodigal in splendid ecclesiastical edifices), after a decade of wild irreligious iconoclasm; after the total suppression or great reduction, by the common consent of Christendom, of monastic institutions, the secularisation of their wealth, and the abandonment of their buildings to decay and ruin; our awe and wonder are still commanded, and seem as if they would be commanded for centuries, by the unshaken solidity, spaciousness, height, majesty, and noble harmony of the cathedrals and churches throughout Western Europe. We are amazed at the imagination displayed in every design, at the enormous human power employed in their creation; the wealth which commanded, the consummate science which guided that power; the profound religious zeal which devoted that power, wealth, and science to these high purposes.

The progress and development of this Christian Architecture, Roman, Byzantine, Romanesque or Lombard, Norman, Gothic in its successive forms, could not be compressed into a few pages: the value of such survey must depend on its accuracy and truth, its accuracy and truth on the multiplicity and fulness of its details, and on the fine subtlety of its distinctions, and might seem to demand illustrations from other arts. It is hardly less difficult to express in a narrow compass the religious, hierarchical,

and other convergent causes which led to the architecturci Christianisation of the West in its two great characteristl-forms. These forms may perhaps be best described as Cisalpine (Italian) and Transalpine (Gothic), though neither of them respected the boundary of the other, and the Teutonic-Gothic in the North arose out of the Southern Romanesque.

Our history has already surveyed Christian Architecture in its origin; it has traced the primitive form of the churches in the East;[a] so far as they differed in their distribution from the Western, resembling the Pagan rather than the Jewish temple, yet of necessity assuming their own peculiar and distinct character. It has seen in the West the Basilicæ, the great hall of imperial justice, offering its more commodious plan and arrangements, and becoming with far less alteration a Christian edifice for public worship and instruction.[b] This first epoch of Christian Architecture extended, even after the conversion of Constantine and the building of Constantinople, to the reign of Justinian, under whom Byzantine Architecture, properly so distinguished, drew what may be called the architectural division between the East and the West. Even in Architecture the Greek and Latin Churches were to be oppugnant; though the Byzantine, as will appear, made a strong effort, and not without partial success, to subjugate the West.

To Rome, not to Greece, Christian Architecture owed its great elementary principle, the key-stone, as it were, to all its greatness; and this principle was carried out with infinitely greater boldness and fulness in the West than in the East. And surely it is no fanciful analogy that as the Roman character contributed so powerfully to the great hierarchical system of the West, so the Roman form of building influenced most extensively Christian Architecture, temporarily and imperfectly that of the East, in perpetuity that of the Latin world. After a few centuries the more dominant hierarchism of the West is manifest in the oppugnancy between Greek and Latin Church Architecture. The East having once wrought

Roman architecture.

[a] Vol. ii. p. 298. Church of Tyre, described by Eusebius.

[b] Vol. ii. pp. 411, 415, and vol. iii. p. 488.

out its architectural type and model settled down in unprogressive, uncreative acquiescence, and went on copying that type with servile and almost undeviating uniformity. In the West, within certain limits, with certain principles, and with a fixed aim, there was freedom, progression, invention. There was a stately unity, unity which seemed to imply immemorial antiquity, and to aspire to be an unalterable irrepealable law for perpetuity, in the form and distribution, in the proportions and harmony of the sacred buildings; but in the details, in the height, the dimensions, the character, the ornaments, the mechanical means of support, infinite inexhaustible variety: it ranged from the most bare and naked Romanesque up to the most gorgeous Gothic.[c]

Latin Christianity by its centralisation, its organisation arising out of Roman respect for law and usage, its rigid subordination, its assertion of and its submission to authority, with a certain secondary freedom of action, had constituted its vast ecclesiastical polity; so one great architectural principle carried out in infinite variety and boundless extent, yet in mutual support and mutual dependence, that of the Arch (if not absolutely unknown, of rare and exceptional application among the Greeks), had given solidity and stability to the gigantic structures of Rome, which spread out and soared above each other in ambitious unending rivalry. Hence the power of multiplying harmonious parts, of inclosing space to almost infinite dimensions, of supporting almost in the air the most ponderous roofs, of making a vast complicated whole one in design, one in structure, one in effect. The Greek temples and the

[c] Compare Hope on Architecture, p. 59. All that has been discovered of the knowledge and use of the Arch in Egypt and in other countries, tends to the same result as that to which Mr. Hope arrived: "The Arch which the Greeks knew not, or if they knew, did not employ." So with other nations. It was first among the Romans an elementary and universal principle of construction. It is impossible not to refer with respect to the first modern philosophical and comprehensive work on Architecture, that by the author of Anastasius. Some corrections, manifold details, much scientific knowledge, have been added by the countless writers on Christian Architecture, of which England has furnished her full share,—Whewell, Willis, Petit, the Author of the Glossary of Architecture, the late Mr. Gally Knight. But who of all these will not own his obligations to Mr. Hope? The recollection of much friendly kindness in my youth enhances the pleasure with which I pay this tribute to a man of real and original genius.

Roman temples on the Greek model, limited in size and extent by the necessity of finding support for horizontal pressure, were usually isolated edifices, each in its exquisite harmony and perfection, complete, independent, simple. If they were sometimes crowded together, as in the Acropolis of Athens, or the Forum at Rome, yet each stood by itself in its narrow precincts; it was a separate republic, as it were the domain and dwelling of its own God, the hall of its own priesthood.

But through that single principle of the Arch the Roman had attained a grandeur and vastness of construction as yet unknown. It was not like the colossal fanes of Egypt, either rocks hewn into temples, or rocks transported and piled up into temples; or the fabrics supported on the immense monolithic pillars in the Eastern cities (which the Romans themselves in the time of the Antonines and their successors rivalled at Baalbec and Palmyra); nor yet the huge terraced masses of brickwork in the further East. The transcendant and peculiar Architecture of the Romans was seen in their still more vast theatres and amphitheatres, which could contain thousands and thousands of spectators; in their Cæsarean palaces, which were almost cities; in their baths, in which the population of considerable towns, or whole quarters of Rome, found space not for bathing only, but for every kind of recreation and amusement; in their bridges, which spanned the broadest and most turbulent rivers; and their aqueducts, stretching out miles after miles, and conveying plentiful water to the central city. It remained only to apply this simple, universal principle. By resting not the horizontal entablature, but the succession of arches on the capitals of the pillars, the length might be infinitely drawn out; the roof, instead of being limited in its extent by the length of the rafters, might be vaulted over and so increased enormously in width; and finally, suspended as it were in the air, soar to any height.

Christian Architecture, when the world under Constantine became Christian, would of course begin to display itself more boldly, more ostentatiously. It would aspire to vie with the old religion in the majesty of its temples. Not but that long before it had its public

Constantine the Great.

sacred edifices in the East and the West. Still it would be some time before it would confront Paganism, the Paganism of centuries. It must still in vastness and outward grandeur submit to the supremacy of the ancestral temples of the city. The Basilica, too, in its ordinary form, though in its length, height, and proportions there might be a severe and serious grandeur, was plain. A high unadorned wall formed its sides, its front was unbroken but by the portals: it had not its splendid rows of external columns, with their interchanging light and shade; nor the rich and sculptured pediment over its entrance. Constantine, before his departure to the East, erected more than one church, no doubt worthy of an imperial proselyte, for the new religion of the empire. But earthquakes, conflagrations, wars, tumults, the prodigal reverence of some Popes, the vast ambition of others, have left not a vestige of the Constantinian buildings in Rome. The Church on the Lateran, thrown down by an earthquake, was rebuilt by Sergius III. That built in honour of St. Peter[d] (it was asserted and believed over the place of his martyrdom), with its splendid fore court and its five aisles, which to the time of Charlemagne, though the prodigal piety of some Popes had no doubt violated its original, it should seem, almost cruciform, outline, and sheathed its walls in gold and precious marbles; yet maintained the plan and distribution of the old church. It stood, notwithstanding the ravages of the Saracens, the sieges of the Emperors, the seditions of the people, on its primitive Constantinian site for many hundred years after, and was only swept away by the irreverent haughtiness of Julius II., to make way for what was expected to, and which does, command the universal wonder of mankind, the St. Peter's of Bramante and Michael Angelo. The noble church of St. Paul, without the walls, built by Theodosius the Great, stood as it were the one majestic representative of the Imperial Christian Basilica till our own days.[e] The ground plan of the Basilica must be

[d] On the old St. Peter's, see the curious work of Bonanni, Historia Templi Vaticani (Roma. 1706), and the elaborate chapter in Bunsen and Platner, Rom's Beschreibung.

[e] The author saw this stately and venerable building in the summer of 1822: it was burned down in the autumn of that year.

sought in the humbler Church of S. Clemente,[f] which alone retains it in its integrity: S. Maria Maggiore, S. Lorenzo, and one or two others, have been so overlaid with alterations as only to reveal to the most patient study distinct signs of their original structure.

Constantinople rose a Christian city, but a Christian city probably in most parts built by Roman hands, or by Greeks with full command of Roman skill and science, and studiously aspired to be an eastern Rome. As her Senators, her Patricians, so probably many of her architects and artists came from Rome; or if Greeks, were instructed and willing to conform to Roman habits and usage. The courtiers of Constantinople, who migrated from the old to the new Rome, were surprised, it is said, to find palaces so closely resembling their own, that they hardly believed themselves to have been transported from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Bosphorus. Constantine himself was a Western by birth and education; Rome therefore rather than the East would furnish the first model for the Christian Churches. In old Byzantium there were probably few temples of such magnificence as to tempt the Christians to usurp them for their own uses, or allure them to the imitation of their forms. Nor did such temples, dilapidated and deserted, as in later times in Rome and Italy, furnish inexhaustible quarries from which triumphant Christianity might seize and carry off her legitimate spoils. There were not at hand rows of noble pillars, already hewn, fluted or polished, with their bases and capitals, which, accustomed to form the porch, or to flank the heathen temple, now took their stand along the nave of the church, or before the majestic vestibule. Though Constantine largely plundered other works of art, statues of bronze or marble (somewhat incongruous heathen ornaments of a Christian city), yet he can have had no great quantity of materials from old temples, unless at much cost of freight from more remote cities, to work up in his churches.[g] On the other hand neither were there many, if

[f] See the S. Clemente in Mr. Gally Knight's splendid and munificent work; which has the rare excellence, that the beauty of the engravings does not interfere with their scrupulous accuracy.

[g] See Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 409.

there was a single Basilica, such as were found in most Italian cities, ready to undergo the slight necessary transmutation. Yet there can be no doubt that the first churches in Constantinople were in the Basilican form; that S. Sophia was of an oblong shape there is satisfactory authority; it was not till the reign of Constantius that the area was enlarged to a square.[h]

This, then, which may be called the Roman or Basilican, may be considered as the first age of Christian Architecture.

II. Of true Byzantine Architecture Justinian was the parent. Time, earthquakes, seditions nowhere so furious and destructive as in Constantinople, nor so destructive as the famous one in the reign of Justinian; more ambitious or more prodigal Emperors, or more devout and wealthy Christians, denied duration to the primitive Churches of Constantinople. The edifices of Constantine, in all likelihood hastily run up, and, if splendid, wanting in strength and solidity, gave place to more stately and enduring churches. The S. Sophia of Constantine was razed to the ground in a fierce tumult; but on its site arose the new S. Sophia, in the East the pride, in the West the wonder, of the world.[i] The sublime unity and harmony of the design, above all the lightness and vastness of the cupola, were too marvellous for mere human science. Even the skill of the famous architects Anthimus of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus were unequal to the conception. An angel revealed to the Emperor (Justinian himself must share in the glory) many of the forms of the building; the great principle of the construction of the

[h] It was of great length, δρόμικος, the form of a Dromos, or Circus for races. See Ducange, Descriptio S. Sophiæ; and also on the enlargement by Constantius. The Church in the Blachernæ, built so late as Justin, had straight rows of pillars and a timber roof. The Church of S. John Studius, still existing, is of the basilican form of that period.—Schnaase, Geschichte der Bildenden Kunst, iii. p. 123, note. On the other hand the Church of Antioch, described by Eusebius and by Theophilus, was an octagon, as was that of Nazianzum.—Schnaase, p. 124. The round form, not unknown in the East, nor in the West, as that of S. Constanza near Rome, was more used for Baptisteries, and for monumental chapels, as the tomb of Galla Placidia at Ravenna.

[i] To the poem of Paulus Silentiarius, on the building and dedication of S. Sophia (Edition Bonn), are appended the laborious dissertation of Ducange, and the perspicuous illustrated essay of Banduri. They contain everything relating to the structure.

cupola, sought in vain by the science of the architects, flashed across the mind of the Emperor himself in a dream. The cupola did not seem, according to the historian Procopius, to rest on its supports, but to be let down by a golden chain from heaven.[k] Santa Sophia was proclaimed in the West as the most consummate work of Christian Architecture.[m]

But Justinian was not content to be the founder and lawgiver of Christian art; as in empire, so he aspired in all things, to bring the whole Roman world under his dominion. To conquered Italy he brought back the vast code of the Civil Law, which he had organised and adapted to Christian use; to Italy came also his architecture, an immense amplification of the Roman arch, which was to be, if not the law, the perfect form of the Christian Church. San Vitale arose in Ravenna, the Constantinople of the West. In dimensions only and in the gorgeousness of some of its materials, San Vitale must bow before its Byzantine type Santa Sophia, but it closely resembled it in plan and arrangement. The Mosaics of the Emperor and of the Empress Theodora in the choir might seem as though they would commend San Vitale as the perfect design for a Christian Church to subject Italy and to the West. Rome indeed might seem, even in Ravenna, to offer a more gallant resistance to the arts than to the arms of Justinian. To San Vitale she would oppose the noble S. Apollinaris, in her own basilican form. Of the ancient basilicas, since the destruction of St. Paul without the walls at Rome, S. Apollinaris at Ravenna, with its twenty-four columns of rich Greek marble from Constantinople, and its superb

[k] τουτόυ δὲ τοῦ κυκλοτεροῦς παμμεγέθης ἐπαναστηκυῖά τις σφαιροειδὴς θόλος ποιεῖται, αὐτὸ διαφερόντως εὐπρόσωπον· δοκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ στερρᾶς τῆς οἰκοδομίας διὰ τὸ παρειμένον τῆς οἰκοδομίας ἑστάναι, ἀλλὰ τῇ σειρῇ τῇ χρυσῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξημμένη καλύπτειν τὸν χῶρον.—Procop. de Ædif. i. p. 177, Edit. Bonn.

[m] "Cujus opus adeo cuncta ædificia excellit ut in totis terrarum spatiis huic simile non possit inveniri."—Paul Warnefrid. S. Sophia and some other Constantinopolitan churches have become better known during the last year (1854) from the splendid work published by M. Salzenberg, at the expense of the King of Prussia. An Italian architect, M. Fossato, having been entrusted with the repairs, the whole structure has been surveyed, measured and drawn. Many mosaics covered up since the transmutation into a mosque have for a time revealed again in all their brilliancy some very remarkable specimens of Byzantine mosaic art.

mosaics, is undoubtedly the most impressive and august in the world.[n]

Thus, then, there were two forms which contested for the supremacy in Italy. One was the old Roman Basilica, with its stately length, which by slow and imperceptible degrees became cruciform by the extension into transepts of the space between the end of the nave (where rose a great arch, called the Arch of Triumph, as opening upon the holy mysteries of the faith), and the conch or apse, before which stood the high altar. The other was square or octagon, which in the same manner and by the same slow process broke into the short equal-limbed Greek cross.[o] This latter form, with the cupola, was the vital distinction of the Byzantine style.[p] Rome remained faithful to her ancient basilican form; but in many of the cities of Northern Italy the more equal proportion of the length and width, with the central cupola, sometimes multiplied on the extended limbs of the transept; these, the only creations of Byzantine architecture, found favour. Venice early took her eastern character; her old cathedral at Torcello, in later times St. Mark's maintained the Byzantine form.[q] St. Mark's, with her Greek plan, her domes, her mosaics, might seem as if she had prophetically prepared a fit and congenial place for the reception of the spoils of the Constantinopolitan Churches after the Latin conquest. But many other of the Lombard Churches, in Pavia, Parma, the old cathedral at Brescia, were square, octagon, or in the form of the Greek cross. As late as the tenth century Ancona, still a Greek city, raised the Church of S. Cyriac, with much of what is called Lombard, more properly Romanesque ornament, but in form a strictly Byzantine Church.[r]

[n] See this church in Gally Knight.

[o] It is not known when the form of the Cross began. Mr. Gally Knight observes that the form of the Cross was for many centuries the exception rather than the rule.

[p] Procopius states of S. Sophia, ἴσος δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ μῆκος οὕτως ἐν ἐπιστηδίῳ ἐπιτετορνεύεται, ὥστε καὶ τετράμηκης, καὶ ὅλως ἰσότιμα οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου εἰρήσεται, p. 174.—So too that of S. Mary and S. Michael, c. iii. p. 174. S. Anthimus, c. vi. p. 194. That of the Apostles was a Greek Cross, c. iii. p. 188.

[q] The round churches, which were few, gave place to Baptisteries, for which or for sepulchral chapels they were mostly originally designed.

[r] It is curious that Charlemagne's cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle is the one true Byzantine church or type of a Byzantine church beyond the Alps—in

Yet on the whole the architectural, as the civil conquests of Justinian, were but partial and unenduring. The Latin Architecture, with these exceptions, even in Italy, adhered to the basilican form or to the longer Latin cross: beyond the Alps the square form was far more rare. But it is singular to observe in both the development of the hierarchical principle according to the character and circumstances of the Eastern and the Western Church. As the worship throughout Christendom became more local, more material, the altar was now the Holy of Holies, the actual abode of the Real Presence of Christ. The Clergy withdrew more entirely into their unapproachable sanctity; they would shroud themselves from all profane approximation by solemn mystery, the mystery which arises from remoteness, from obscurity or dimness, or even from secrecy. For this end, to heighten the awe which he would throw around the tremendous sacrifice, and around himself the hallowed minister of that sacrifice, the Greek, in himself less awful, had recourse to artificial means. The Latin trusted to his own inherent dignity, aided only by more profound distance, by the splendour which environed him, splendour more effective as heightened by surrounding darkness. The shorter Greek cross did not repel the adoring worshipper far enough off; the Greek therefore drew a veil. At length he raised a kind of wall between himself and the worshippers, and behind, in that enclosed sanctuary he performed the mystery of consecration, and came forth and showed himself in turn at each of the side doors of the Holy of Holies, rarely at the central or royal gate, with the precious paten and chalice in his hands. When the service was over, he withdrew again with his awful treasure into its secret sanctuary.[8] In the longer Latin cross the hierarchy might recede to a commanding distance from the great mass of worshippers, yet all might remain open; the light rails of the chancel were sufficient,

Difference of Greek and Latin services.

form, construction, even in mosaics. Charlemagne had perhaps Greek architects, he had seen Ravenna, he drew ornaments and materials from Ravenna. Compare Schnaase, vol. xiv. 486 *et seqq.*

[8] Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 64. This, called the Iconostasis, is general in the Russian churches.

with their own inherent majesty, to keep the profane on their lower level, and in their humble posture of far-off adoration. In the West the crypt under the altar, to contain the bones of the saint or martyr, was more general; the altar therefore was more usually approached by a flight of steps, and thus elevation was added to distance: and to distance and elevation were added by degrees the more dazzling splendour of the altar-furniture, the crosses, the candlesticks, the plate, the censers, and all the other gorgeous vessels, their own dresses, the violet, green, scarlet, cloth of gold, the blaze of lamps and tapers, the clouds of incense. At one time the altar and the officiating clergy were wrapped in the mystery of sublime gloom, at the next the whole altar, and all under the stately Baldachin, burst out into a concentred brilliancy of light. The greater length of the building, with its succursal aisles and ambulatories and chapels, as so admirably adapted for processional services, would greatly promote their introduction and use. The Clergy would no longer be content with dim and distant awe and veneration; this was now inherent in their persons: and so, environed with their sacred symbols, bearing their banners emblazoned with the image of the crucified Redeemer, of the Virgin, of the Saints, and the crosses, the emblems of their own authority and power, and in their snow-white or gorgeous dresses, they would pass through the rows of wondering and kneeling worshippers, with their grave and solemn chant, or amid the peals of the thundering organ, bringing home, as it were, to the hearts of all, the most serious religious impressions, as well as those of their own peculiar inalienable sanctity.

But the oppugnancy was not only in the internal form and arrangements of the sacred buildings or the more effective display of ecclesiastic magnificence. In splendour of dress, in the richness of their church furniture and vessels, in the mysterious symbolism of their services, the East boasted itself even superior to the West. But the more vigorously developed hierarchical spirit among the Latins displayed itself in nothing more than in its creativeness, in its progressive advancement in Christian Architecture. The Emperors were in general the founders and

builders of the great Eastern Churches, in the West to a vast extent the Church herself. Though kings and nobles were by no means wanting in these signs of prodigal piety —the Catholic Lombard kings, the priest-ruled Merovingians, Charlemagne and his descendants, the sovereigns in England—there were also, besides these royal and noble devotees, the magnificent Prelates, the splendid Abbots, the opulent Chapters. In the East it was the State acting it might be under the influence, in obedience to, or at the suggestion of the Priesthood; in the West with the Monarch and the Baron, it was the whole ecclesiastical Order out of its own enormous wealth, its own vast possessions, and still accumulating property. From the seventh at least to the close of the fourteenth century this wealth was steadily on the increase, at times pouring in like a flood; if draining off, draining but in narrow and secret channels. It was in the nature of things that a large portion of this wealth should be consecrated, above all others, to this special use. It had long been admitted that a fifth, a fourth, a third of the ecclesiastical endowments belonged to the sustentation, to the embellishment of the religious fabrics. But it needed no law to enforce on a wide scale this expenditure demanded at once by every holy and generous principle, by every ambitious among the more far-sighted and politic, as well as by every more sordid, motive. Throughout Christendom there was the high and pure, as well as the timid and superstitious religion, which invited, encouraged, commanded, exacted, promised to reward in this world and in the next, these noble works of piety. Without as within the Church these motives were in perpetual, unslumbering activity. Church-building was, as it were, the visible personal sacrifice to God, a sacrifice which could never be fully accomplished; it was the grateful or expiatory oblation to the Redeemer and to the Saints. The dying king, the dying noble, the dying rich man, or the king, noble, or rich man, under strong remorse during his lifetime, might with more lofty and disinterested urgency be pressed by the priest or the confessor to make the bequest or the gift to a holy work in which the clergy had no direct advantage, and which was in

Wealth of the clergy.

some sort a splendid public benefaction. The Church was built for the poor, for the people, for posterity. What the splendour of the old Asiatic monarchs had done for the perpetuation of their own luxury and glory, the Egyptians for their burying-places, as well as in honour of their gods; what the narrower patriotism of the Greeks for the embellishment of their own cities, for the comfort and enjoyment of the citizens: what the stern pride of the older, the enormous wealth and ostentation of the later republicans at Rome; what the Pagan Emperors had done, the elder Cæsars to command the wonder, gratitude, adulation of the mistress of the world; Trajan, Hadrian, the Antonines, from policy, vanity, beneficence, on a wider and more cosmopolitan scale throughout the Empire: what had been thus done in many various ways, was now done by most kings and most rich men in one way alone.[1] Besides temples the heathen Cæsars had raised palaces, theatres, amphitheatres, circuses, baths, roads, bridges, aqueducts, senate-houses, porticoes, libraries, cemeteries. Now the only public buildings, unless here and there a bridge (until the burghers in the commercial cities began to raise their guildhalls), were the church and the castle. The castle was built more for strength than for splendour. Architecture had the Church alone and her adjacent buildings on which to lavish all her skill, and to expend the inexhaustible treasures poured at her feet. To build the Church was admitted at once as the most admirable virtue, as the most uncontested sign of piety, as the fullest atonement for sin, as the amplest restitution for robbery or wrong, as the bounden tribute of the loyal subject of God, as the most unquestioned recognition of the sovereignty and mercy of God.

Incentives for Church buildings.

If these incentives were for ever working without the Church, besides these, what powerful concurrent and subsidiary motives were in action within the Church! Every Prelate, even each member of a Chapter (if he had any noble or less sordid feeling than personal

[1] Let it be remembered that in Paris, in the time of Philip the Fair, the house of the Templars was stronger if not more magnificent than the King's palace in the Louvre. What in comparison were the more sumptuous religious buildings?

indulgence in pomp and luxury, or the least ecclesiastical public spirit), would feel emulation of his spiritual ancestors: he would delight to put to shame the less prodigal, the more parsimonious generosity of his predecessor, would endeavour to transcend him in the richness of his oblation to God or to the Patron Saint. He would throw down that predecessor's meaner work, and replace it by something more splendid and enduring. Posthumous glory would assume a sacred character: the Prelate would not be inflexibly and humbly content with obscure goodness, or with the unwitnessed virtues, which would rest entirely on the reward in the world to come. The best and wisest might think that if their names lived on earth with their imperishable Cathedrals, it was a pardonable, if not a pious and laudable ambition. Their own desire of glory would so mingle with what they esteemed the glory of God, as to baffle their discrimination. So too national, municipal, corporate, local pride and interest would disguise themselves as the love of God and man. The fane of some tutelary saint, or some shrine of peculiar holiness or of wonder-working power, which attracted more numerous and more devout pilgrims, as it enriched the Church, the city, the town, the village, so it would demand even from gratitude a larger share of the votive offerings. The Saint must be rewarded for his favours, for his benefits; his church, his chapel, and his shrine must be more splendid, as more splendid would be more attractive; and thus splendour would beget wealth, wealth gladly devote itself to augment the splendour.

The Church. The Priests.

Throughout, indeed, there was this latent, and unconscious it might be, but undeniable influence operating through the whole sacerdotal Order, through the whole Monkhood, and not less among the more humble Friars. Every church was not merely the house of God, it was also the palace where the religious Sovereign, the Ecclesiastic, from the Pope to the lowliest Parish Priest, held his state; it was the unassailable fortress of his power; it was, I use the word with reluctance, the Exchange where, by the display of his wealth, he immeasurably increased that wealth. To the Ecclesiastic belonged the chancel, not to be entered

by unsanctified feet; to him in his solitary or in his corporate dignity, only attended by a retinue of his own Order; his were the costly dresses, the clouds of incense. The more magnificent the church, and the more sumptuous the services, the broader the line which divided him from the vulgar, the rest of mankind. If he vouchsafed some distinction, some approach towards his unapproachable majesty, as when the Emperor took his seat at the entrance or within the chancel, read the Gospel, and was graciously permitted to perform some of the functions of a Deacon, this but threw back the rest of mankind to more humble distance. Those passages which the haughtiest Popes alleged in plain words, as "Ye are Gods," which was generally read, "Ye are Christs (the anointed of God)," almost revoked, or neutralised in the minds of the Priesthood, the specious reservation that it was God in them, and not themselves, which received these honours. Popular awe and reverence knows no nice theological discrimination; at least a large share of the veneration to the Saint or the Redeemer, to God, rested, as it passed, on the Hierarchy. They were recognised as those without whose mediation no prayer passed onward to the throne of grace; they stood on a step, often a wide step, higher in the ascent to heaven. Everywhere, through the whole framework of society, was this contrast, and the contrast was to the advantage of the Hierarchy. The highest and richest Bishop, in his episcopal palace might see the castle of the Baron not only in its strength, but in its height, its domains, its feudal splendour, its castellated richness, frowning contemptuously down upon him; he might seem to be lurking, as it were, a humble retainer under its shadow and under its protection. But enter the church! the Baron stood afar off, or knelt in submissive, acknowledged, infelt inferiority; and it was seldom that in the city the cathedral did not outsoar and outspread with its dependent buildings—its baptistery, chapter-house, belfry, cloisters—the rival castle with all its outbuildings. That which in the cathedral city long held the Ecclesiastics in their separate peculiar majesty, went down in due proportion through the town to the village, to the meanest hamlet. In the feudal castle itself the chapel was almost always the most richly

decorated. During war, in the siege, in the boisterous banquet, the chaplain might be self-levelled, or levelled by a lawless chief and lawless soldiery, to a humble retainer; in the chapel he resumed his proper dignity. It was his fault, his want of influence, if the chapel was not maintained in greater decency and splendour than the rude hall or ruder chamber; and reverence to the chapel reacted on the reverence to himself.

Add to all this the churches or chapels of the religious houses, and there was hardly a religious house without its church or chapel, many of them equal or surpassing in grandeur, in embellishment, those of the town or of the city. In a religious foundation the Church could not, for very shame, be less than the most stately and the most splendid edifice. Year after year, century after century, if any part of the monastery was secure from dilapidation, if any part was maintained, rebuilt, redecorated, it would be the church. The vow of humility, the vow of poverty was first tacitly violated, first disdainfully thrown aside, by the severest Order, in honour of God. The sackcloth-clad, bare-foot Friar would watch and worship on the cold stone or the hard board; but within walls enriched with the noblest paintings, tapestried with the most superb hangings, before an altar flashing with the gold pix, with the jewelled vessels, with the rich branching candlesticks. Assisi, not many years after the death of St. Francis, had begun to be the most splendid and highly adorned church in Italy.

Thus then architecture was the minister at once and servant of the Church, and a vast proportion of the wealth of the world was devoted to the works of architecture. Nor was it in a secular point of view a wasteful pomp and prodigality. If the church was the one building of the Priest, so was it of the people. It was the single safe and quiet place where the lowest of the low found security, peace, rest, recreation, even diversion. If the chancel was the Priest's, the precincts, the porch, the nave were open to all; the Church was all which the amphitheatre, the bath, the portico, the public place, had been to the poor in the heathen cities. It was

The Church the people's.

more than the house of prayer and worship, where the peasant or the beggar knelt side by side with the burgher or the Baron; it was the asylum, not of the criminal only, but of the oppressed, the sad, the toil-worn, the infirm, the aged. It was not only dedicated to God; it was consecrated to the consolation, the peace, even the enjoyment of man. Thus was it that architecture was raising all its wondrous structures in the West, if for the advancement of the Hierarchy, so too at the perpetual unsleeping instigation, at the cost, and it should seem under the special direction, of the Hierarchy: for no doubt within the precincts of the cathedral, within the cloister, much of the science of architecture was preserved, perpetuated, enlarged; if the architects were not themselves Ecclesiastics, they were under the protection, patronage, direction, instruction of Ecclesiastics. But it was also of the most indubitable benefit to mankind. Independent of the elevating, solemnising, expanding effects of this most material and therefore most universally impressive of the Fine Arts, what was it to all mankind, especially to the prostrate and down-trodden part of mankind, that though these buildings were God's, they were, in a certain sense, his own; he who had no property, not even in his own person, the serf, the villain, had a kind of right of proprietorship in his parish church, the meanest artisan in his cathedral. It is impossible to follow out to their utmost extent, or to appreciate too highly the ennobling, liberalising, humanising, Christianising effects of church architecture during the Middle Ages.

III. The third period of Christian architecture (reckoning as the first the Roman Basilica, as the second the proper Byzantine, with its distinctive Greek cross and cupolas) lasted with the Norman till the introduction of the Pointed or so-called Gothic in the twelfth century. This style has been called Lombard, as having first flourished in the cities of Northern Italy, which under the later Kings attained unwonted peace and prosperity, and in which the cities rose to industry, commerce, wealth and freedom. Assuredly it was no invention of the rude Lombards, who brought over the Alps only their conquering arms and their hated Arianism. It has been called also Byzantine, improperly, for though it admitted indiscrimi-

Third style. Lombard, Byzantine, or Romanesque.

nately Byzantine and Roman forms and arrangements, its characteristics seem either its own or the traditions of Roman principles, the appropriation and conversion to its use of Roman examples. Its chief characteristic is delight in the multiplication of the arch, not only for the support, but for the ornamentation of the building. Within and without there is the same prodigality of this form. But these rows or tiers of arches, without supporting or seeming to support the roof, or simply decorative, appear to be no more than the degenerate Roman, as seen in the Palace of Dioclesian at Spalatro, and usefully as well as ornamentally employed in the Coliseum and in other amphitheatres. Gradually the west front of the Church, or the front opposite to the altar, grew into dignity and importance. The central portal, sometimes the three portals, or even five portals, lost their square-headed form, became receding arches, arches within arches, decorated with graceful or fantastic mouldings. Above, tier over tier, were formed rows of arches (unless where a rich wheel or rose window was introduced) up to the broad bold gable, which was sometimes fringed as it were just below with small arches following out its line. Sometimes these arches ran along the side walls; almost always either standing out more or less, or in open arcades, they ran round the semicircular eastern apse. Besides these, slender compound piers or small buttresses are carried up the whole height to the eaves. They arrive at length at the severer model of this form, San Zeno at Verona, or the richer, the San Michele at Lucca. Within the church the pillars, as the models of those in the ancient buildings disappeared (the Roman Corinthian long survived), or rather as the ruins of ancient buildings ceased to be the quarries for churches, gradually lost their capitals. From those sprung the round arches in a bolder or more timid sweep, according to the distance or solidity of the pillars. Above the nave a second row of arches formed the clerestory windows. The roof, in general of timber, was first flat, then curved, at length vaulted. Over the centre of the cross rose the cupola, round, octagon, or of more fanciful forms. In the seventh century the introduction of bells, to summon to the service, drew on the invention of the architect. The dome or cupola was not a convenient

form for a belfry. Beside the building it had not been unusual to erect a baptistery, circular or polygonal, such as are still seen in the richest form, and almost rivalling the churches, in Florence and in Parma. Throughout Lombardy, in most parts of Italy, rose the detached campanile, sometimes round, in general square, terminating at times with a broad flat roof, more rarely towering into a spire. In Italy this third epoch of architecture culminated in the Cathedral of Pisa. It was the oblation of the richest and most powerful city in Italy, at the height of her prosperity, her industry, her commerce, her fame; it was made in the pride of her wealth, in a passion of gratitude for a victory and for rich plunder taken from the Mohammedans in the harbour of Palermo. Pisa found an architect worthy of her profuse magnificence; the name of Boscheto lives in this his unrivalled edifice. It is not only that the cathedral makes one of those four buildings—the Dome, the Baptistery, the Leaning Tower, the Campo Santo—which in their sad grandeur in the deserted city surpass all other groups of buildings in Europe: the cathedral standing alone would command the highest admiration. On the exterior the west front displays that profusion of tiers of arches above arches, arranged with finer proportion, richness, and upward decreasing order, than elsewhere. But its sublimity is within. Its plan, the Latin cross in the most perfect proportion, gives its impressive unity to its central nave, with its double aisles, its aisled transepts, its receding apse. Its loftiness is far more commanding than any building of its class in Italy had as yet aspired to reach. The Corinthian pillars along the nave are of admirable height and proportion;[u] those of the aisles lower, but of the same style. The arches spring boldly from the capitals of the pillars; the triforium above, running down the long nave, is singularly picturesque. While the long, bold, horizontal architrave gives the sedate regularity of the Basilica; the crossings of the transepts, the sweep of the curved apse, even without the effective mosaic of Cimabue, close the view with lines of the most felicitous and noble form.

[u] The pointed arch from the nave to the transepts is of later date; incongruous but not without effect.

Nothing can contrast more strongly, in the same architecture, than the Transalpine Romanesque architecture with Pisa.[x] It is seen in all the old cities on the Rhine (the earliest form in St. Castor at Coblentz), later at Spires, Worms, Mentz, Bonn, the older churches at Cologne; east of the Rhine in the older cities or monasteries, as in Corvey. It is more rude but more bold; they might seem the works of the great feudal Prelates; with a severe grandeur, not without richness of decoration, but disdaining grace or luxuriance. They are of vast size, as may beseem Prelate Princes, but of the coarse red or grey stone of the country, no fine wrought freestone, no glittering marble. The pillars are usually without capitals, or with capitals fantastic and roughly hewn; they would impress by strength and solidity rather than by harmony or regularity.[y] In the south of France this style is traced not only in cathedral cities, but in many very curious parochial churches. With few exceptions, it is there more picturesque and fanciful than grand or solemn. In the north of France and in England this architecture received such a powerful impulse from the Normans as almost to form a new epoch in the art.

IV. That wonderful people the Normans, though without creative power, seemed as it were to throw their whole strength and vigour into architecture, as into everything else. They had their kingdoms on the Mediterranean, and on either side of the British Channel. In the South they had become Southerns; even in architecture they anticipated from the Mohammedans some approximation to the Gothic, the pointed arch. In the North, on the other hand, as by adopting and domiciling men of Roman or Italian cultivation, they had braced the intellect of the degenerate Church to young energy, and had trained learned Churchmen and theologians, Lanfrancs and Anselms; so taking the form, the structure, the architectural science of universal Latin Christendom, they gave it a grandeur, solidity, massiveness, even height, which might seem intended to confront a ruder element, more wild

The Normans.

[x] See for the Saxon Romanesque Schnaase.

[y] Mr. Petit has published engravings of many of these buildings.

and tempestuous weather. The Norman cathedrals might almost seem built for warlike or defensive purposes; as though their Heathen ancestors, having in their fierce incursions destroyed church and monastery, as well as castle and town, they would be prepared for any inroad of yet un-Christianised Northmen. That great characteristic of the Norman churches, the huge square central tower, was battlemented like a castle. The whole impression is that of vast power in the architect, unshaken duration in the edifice; it is the building of a Hierarchy which has unfailing confidence in its own strength, in its perpetuity. Without, in the general design there is plainness, almost austerity; the walls, visibly of enormous thickness, are pierced with round arched windows of no great size, but of great depth; the portals are profound recesses, arch within arch resting on short stubborn pillars; the capitals are rude, but boldly projecting; the rich ornaments cut with a vigorous and decisive hand: the zigzag or other mouldings with severity in their most prodigal richness. In the interior, all again is simple to the disdain, in its greater parts, of ornament. The low, thick, usually round pillars, with capitals sometimes indulging in wild shapes, support, with their somewhat low arches, the ponderous wall, in its turn pressed down as it were by the ponderous roof. Such are the works of our Norman Kings, the two abbeys at Caen, Jumieges in its ruins, St. George de Boscherville; such in our island, Durham, parts of Peterborough and Ely, Gloucester, the two square towers of Exeter. If later and more splendid cathedrals inspire a higher devotion, none breathe more awe and solemnity than the old Norman.[z]

Gothic architecture.

V. On a sudden, in a singularly short period, the latter half of the twelfth century (though discerning eyes may trace, and acute minds have traced with remarkable success and felicity, this transition), Christian architecture beyond the Alps, in Germany, in France, in England, becomes creative. Nothing but the distribution and arrangement of the parts of the church remains the

[z] See Mr. Gally Knight's Norman Tour, and Normans in Sicily. Mr. Knight dedicated part of a noble fortune to these studies, illustrating his own excellent judgement by the well-remunerated labours of accomplished artists.

[a] Dr. Whewell, Mr. Willis, Mr. Petit.

same; and even in that respect the church, instead of standing alone or nearly alone, with the other edifices in humble subordination, is crowded around by a multitude of splendid vassals, partaking in all her decorative richness, the Lady chapel and other chapels, the chapter-house, the monastery, the episcopal palace, the cloisters, sometimes the belfry.

In the church not only are there new forms, not only is there a new principle of harmony, not only a constant substitution of vertical for horizontal lines, new and most exquisite proportions, an absolutely original character, but new principles of construction seem to have revealed themselves. Architecture is not only a new art, awakening different emotions of wonder, awe and admiration, but a new science. It has discovered the secret of achieving things which might seem impossible, but which once achieved, seem at once simple, secure, justificatory of their boldness, from the perfect balance and equable pressure of every part, pressure disguised as it were, as distributed on a multitude of supports, and locked down by superincumbent weights. Such is the unity, however multifarious, of the whole, that the lightest, though loftiest and most vast Gothic cathedral has a look of strength and duration as manifest, as unquestioned, as the most ponderous and massive Romanesque or Norman.

The rapid, simultaneous, and universal growth of this so-called Gothic, its predominance, like its predecessor the Romanesque, through the whole realm of Latin Christendom, is not the least extraordinary fact in the revolution. It has had marked stages of development (now defined with careful discrimination by the able and prolific writers on the art) during several centuries and in all countries, in Germany, France, England, the Netherlands, Spain, even Italy; but its first principles might almost seem to have broke at once on the wondering world. Everywhere the whole building has an upward, it might seem heaven-aspiring tendency; everywhere the arches become more and more pointed, till at length they arrive at the perfect lancet; everywhere the thick and massy walls expand into large mullioned windows; every- Rapid rise and extension.

where the diminished solidity of the walls is supported from without by flying buttresses, now concealed, now become lighter and more graceful, and revealing themselves, not as mere supports, but as integral parts of the building, and resting on outward buttresses; everywhere pinnacles arise, singly or in clusters, not for ornament alone, but for effect and perceptible use; everywhere the roof becomes a ridge more or less precipitate; everywhere the west front becomes more rich and elaborate, with its receding portals covered with niches, which are crowded with statues; everywhere the central tower assumes a more graceful form, or tapers into a spire; often two subordinate towers, or two principal towers, flank the west front; everywhere, in the exuberant prodigality of ornament, knosps, shrine-work, corbels, gurgoyles, there is a significance and a purport. Within the church the pillars along the nave break into graceful clusters around the central shaft; the vaulted roof is formed of the most simple yet intricate ribs; everywhere there are the noblest avenues of straight lines of pillars, the most picturesque crossings and interminglings of arches; everywhere harmony of the same converging lines; everywhere the aim appears to be height, unity of impression, with infinite variety of parts; a kind of heaven-ward aspiration, with the most prodigal display of human labour and wealth, as an oblation to the temple of God.

The Crusades.

The rise of Gothic Architecture, loosely speaking, was contemporaneous with the Crusades.[b] It was natural to suppose that the eyes of the pilgrims were caught by the slender, graceful, and richly decorated forms of the Saracenic mosques, with their minarets and turrets. Pointed windows were discovered in mosques, and held to be the models of the Gothic cathedrals. Even earlier, when the Normans were piling up their massy round arches in the North, they had some pointed arches

[b] The theory of Warburton deriving the Gothic Cathedrals from an imitation of the overarching forests of the ancient Germans (he is disposed to go back to the Druids) is curious as illustrating the strange and total neglect of Mediæval Church History in this country. Here is a divine of almost unrivalled erudition (Jortin excepted) in his day, who seems to suppose that the Germans immediately that they emerged from their forests, set to work to build Gothic cathedrals. He must either have supposed Gothic architecture of the fourth or fifth century, or quietly annihilated the intervening centuries to the twelfth.

in the South, apparently adopted from the Mohammedans of that island.[c] But the pointed arch is only one characteristic of Gothic Architecture, it is a vast step from the imitation of a pointed arch or window (if there were such imitation, which is extremely doubtful), to the creation of a Gothic cathedral.[d] The connection of the Crusades was of another kind, and far more powerful; it was the devotion aroused in all orders by that universal movement, which set into activity all the faculties of man; and the riches poured into the lap of the Clergy, which enabled them to achieve such wonders in so short a period. Religion awoke creative genius, genius worked freely with boundless command of wealth.[e]

Theory of Guild of Freemasons.

This apparently simultaneous outburst, and the universal promulgation of the principles, rules, and practice of the Gothic Architecture, has been accounted for by the existence of a vast secret guild of Freemasons, or of architects. Of this guild, either connected with or latent in the monasteries and among the Clergy, some of whom were men of profound architectural science, and held in their pay and in their subservience all who were not ecclesiastics, it is said, the centre, the quickening, and governing power was in Rome. Certainly of all developments of the Papal influence and wisdom none could be more extraordinary than this summoning into being, this conception, this completion of these marvellous buildings in every part of Latin Christendom. But it is fatal to this theory that Rome is the city in which Gothic Architecture, which some have strangely called the one absolute and exclusive Christian Architecture, has never found its place; even in Italy it has at no time been more than a half-naturalised stranger. It must be supposed that while the Papacy was thus planting the world with Gothic cathedrals, this was but a sort of lofty concession to Transalpine barbarism, while itself adhered to the ancient, venerable, more true and majestic style of ancient Rome. This guild too was so secret as to elude all discovery. History, documentary evidence maintain rigid, inexplicable silence. The ac-

[c] 'Gally Knight, 'Normans in Sicily.' Notes,' p. 35.
[d] Compare Whewell, 'Architectural [e] Note on Architecture.

counts, which in some places have been found, name persons employed. The names of one or two architects, Erwin of Strasburg have survived, but of this guild not one word.[f] The theory is not less unnecessary than without support. Undoubtedly there was the great universal guild, the Clergy and the monastic bodies, who perhaps produced, certainly retained, employed, guided, directed the builders.

State of Europe.

During this period Latin Christendom was in a state of perpetual movement, intercommunication between all parts was frequent, easy, uninterrupted. There were not only now pilgrimages to Rome, but a regular tide setting to and from the East, a concourse to the schools and universities, to Paris, Cologne, Montpellier, Bologna, Salerno: rather later spread the Mendicants. The monasteries were the great caravanseries; every class of society was stirred to its depths; in some cases even the villains broke the bonds which attached them to the soil; to all the abbey or the church opened its hospitable gates. Men skilled and practised in the science of architecture would not rest unemployed, or but poorly employed at home. Splendid prizes would draw forth competition, emulation. Sacerdotal prodigality, magnificence, zeal, rivalry would abroad be famous, attractive at home; they would be above local or national prepossessions. The prelate or the abbot, who had determined in his holy ambition that his cathedral or his abbey should surpass others, and who had unlimited wealth at his disposal, would welcome the celebrated, encourage the promising, builder from whatever quarter of Christendom he came. Thus, within certain limits, great architects would be the architects of the world, or what was then the Western world, Latin Christendom: and so there would be perpetual progress, communication, sympathy in actual design and execution, as well as in the principles and in the science of construction. Accordingly, foreign architects are frequently heard of. Germans crossed the

[f] All the documentary evidence adduced by Mr. Hope amounts to a Papal privilege to certain builders or masons, or a guild of builders, at Como, published by Muratori (Como was long celebrated for its skill and devotion to the art), and a charter to certain painters by our Henry VI. Schnaase (Geschichte der Bildende Kunst, iv. c. 5) examines and rejects the theory. He cites some few instances more of guilds, but local and municipal. The first guild of masons, which comprehended all Germany, was of the middle of the 15th century.

Alps to teach Italy the secret of the new architecture.[h] Each nation indeed seems to have worked out its own Gothic with certain general peculiarities, Germany, France, the Netherlands, England, and later Spain. All seem to aim at certain effects, all recognised certain broad principles, but the application of these principles varies infinitely. Sometimes a single building, sometimes the buildings within a certain district, have their peculiarities. Under a guild, if there had been full freedom for invention, originality, boldness of design, there had been more rigid uniformity, more close adherence to rule in the scientifical and technical parts.

The name of Gothic has ascended from its primal meaning, that of utter contempt, to the highest honour; it is become conventional for the architecture of the Middle Ages, and commands a kind of traditionary reverence. Perhaps Teutonic, or at least Transalpine, might be a more fit appellation. It was born, reached its maturity and perfection north of the Alps. Gothic, properly so called, is a stranger and an alien in Italy. Rome absolutely repudiated it. It was brought across the Alps by German architects; it has ever borne in Italy the somewhat contemptuous name German-Gothic.[i] Among its earliest Italian efforts is one remarkable for its history, as built by a French architect with English gold, and endowed with benefices in England. The Cardinal Gualo, the legate who placed the young Henry III. on the throne of England, as he came back laden with the grateful or extorted tribute of the island, 12,000 marks of silver, encountered an architect of fame at Paris: he carried the Northern with him to his native Vercelli, where the Church of S. Andrea astonished Italy with its pointed arches, as well as the Italian Clergy with the charges fixed for their maintenance on Preferments in remote England.[k] Assisi,

Italian Gothic. A.D. 1218.

[h] All countries, in adopting a neighbouring style, seem however to have worked it with some peculiarities of their own, so that a person conversant with examples can tell, upon inspecting a building, not only to what period it belongs, but to what nation. Much depends on material, much on the style of sculpture, &c.—Willis on Architecture, p. 11. Mr. Rickman's book is most instructive on the three styles predominant successively in England.—Compare Whewell.

[i] Gotico Tedesco. Compare Hope, c. xxxix.

[k] Compare on Cardinal Gualo, vol. iv. p. 306.

for its age the wonder of the world, was built by a German architect. What is called the Lombard or Italian-Gothic, though inharmonious as attempting to reconcile vertical and horizontal lines, has no doubt its own admirable excellencies, in some respects may vie with the Transalpine. Its costly marbles, enlaid into the building, where they do not become alternate layers of black and white (to my judgement an utter defiance of every sound principle of architectural effect), its gorgeousness at Florence, Sienna, its fantastic grace at Orvieto, cannot but awaken those emotions which are the world's recognition of noble architecture.[m] Milan to me, with all its matchless splendour, and without considering the architectural heresy of its modern west front, is wanting in religiousness. It aspires to magnificence, and nothing beyond magnificence. It is a cathedral which might have been erected in the pride of their wealth by the godless Visconti. Nothing can be more wonderful, nothing more graceful, each seen singly, than the numbers numberless, in Milton's words, of the turrets, pinnacles, statues, above, below, before, behind, on every side. But the effect is confusion, a dazzling the eyes and mind, distraction, bewilderment. The statues are a host of visible images basking in the sunshine, not glorified saints calmly ascending to heaven. In the interior the vast height is concealed and diminished by the shrine work which a great way up arrests the eye and prevents it from following the columns up to the roof, and makes a second stage between the pavement and the floor, a decoration without meaning or purport.

There can be no doubt that the birthplace of true Gothic Architecture was north of the Alps; it should seem on the Rhine, or in those provinces of France which then were German, Burgundy, Lorraine, Alsace, bordering on

[m] Professor Willis lays down "that there is in fact no genuine Gothic building in Italy."—On Italian Architecture, p. 4. He is inclined to make exceptions for some churches built in or near Naples by the Angevine dynasty. "The curious result is a style in which the horizontal and vertical lines equally predominate; and which, while it wants alike the lateral extension and repose of the Grecian and the lofty upward tendency and pyramidal majesty of the Gothic, is yet replete with many an interesting and valuable architectural lesson. It exhibits pointed arches, pinnacles, buttresses, tracery and clustered columns, rib-vaultings and lofty towers; all those characteristics, in short, the bare enunciation of which is considered by many writers to be a sufficient definition of Gothic."—Ibid.

the Rhine. It was a splendid gift of Teutonism before Germany rose in insurrection and set itself apart from Latin Christendom. North of the Alps it attained its full perfection; there alone the Cathedral became in its significant symbolism the impersonation of mediæval Christianity.

Climate.

The Northern climate may have had some connection with its rise and development. In Italy and the South the sun is a tyrant; breadth of shadow must mitigate his force; the wide eaves, the bold projecting cornice must afford protection from his burning and direct rays; there would be a reluctance altogether to abandon those horizontal lines, which cast a continuous and unbroken shadow; or to ascend as it were with the vertical up into the unslaked depths of the noonday blaze. The violent rains would be cast off more freely by a more flat and level roof at a plane of slight inclination. In the North the precipitate ridge would cast off the heavy snow, which might have lodged and injured the edifice. So, too, within the Church the Italian had to cool and diminish, the Northern would admit and welcome the flooding light. So much indeed did the Gothic Architecture enlarge and multiply the apertures for light, that in order to restore the solemnity it was obliged to subdue and sheathe as it were the glare, at times overpowering, by painted glass. And thus the magic of the richest colouring was added to the infinitely diversified forms of the architecture.

The Gothic cathedral was the consummation, the completion of mediæval, of hierarchical Christianity. Of that mediævalism, of that hierarchism (though Italy was the domain, and Rome the capital of the Pope), the seat was beyond the Alps. The mediæval hierarchical services did not rise to their full majesty and impressiveness till celebrated under a Gothic cathedral. The Church might seem to expand, and lay itself out in long and narrow avenues, with the most gracefully converging perspective, in order that the worshipper might contemplate with deeper awe the more remote central ceremonial. The enormous height more than compensated for the contracted breadth. Nothing could be more finely arranged for the processional

services; and the processional services became more frequent, more imposing. The music, instead of being beaten down by low broad arches, or lost within the heavier aisles, soared freely to the lofty roof, pervaded the whole building, was infinitely multiplied as it died and rose again to the fretted roof. Even the incense curling more freely up to the immeasurable height, might give the notion of clouds of adoration finding their way to heaven.

Symbolism of Gothic architecture.

The Gothic cathedral remains an imperishable and majestic monument of hierarchical wealth, power, devotion; it can hardly be absolutely called self-sacrifice, for if built for the honour of God and of the Redeemer, it was honour, it was almost worship, shared in by the high ecclesiastic. That however has almost passed away; God, as it were, now vindicates to himself his own. The cathedral has been described as a vast book in stone, a book which taught by symbolic language, partly plain and obvious to the simpler man, partly shrouded in not less attractive mystery. It was at once strikingly significant and inexhaustible; bewildering, feeding at once and stimulating profound meditation. Even its height, its vastness might appear to suggest the Inconceivable, the Incomprehensible in the Godhead, to symbolise the Infinity, the incalculable grandeur and majesty of the divine works; the mind felt humble under its shadow as before an awful presence. Its form and distribution was a confession of faith; it typified the creed. Everywhere was the mystic number; the Trinity was proclaimed by the nave and the aisles (multiplied sometimes as at Bourges and elsewhere to the other sacred number, seven), the three richly ornamented recesses of the portal, the three towers. The Rose over the west was the Unity; the whole building was a Cross. The altar with its decorations announced the Real Perpetual Presence. The solemn Crypt below represented the under world, the soul of man in darkness and the shadow of death, the body awaiting the resurrection. This was the more obvious universal language. By those who sought more abstruse and recondite mysteries, they might be found in all the multifarious details, provoking the zealous curiosity, or dimly suggestive of holy meaning.

Sculpture was called in to aid. All the great objective truths of religion had their fitting place. Even the Father, either in familiar symbol or in actual form, began to appear, and to assert his property in the sacred building. Already in the Romanesque edifices the Son, either as the babe in the lap of his Virgin Mother, on the cross, or ascending into heaven, had taken his place over the central entrance, as it were to receive and welcome the worshipper. Before long he appeared not there alone, though there in more imposing form; he was seen throughout all his wondrous history, with all his acts and miracles, down to the Resurrection, the Ascension, the return to Judgement. Everywhere was that hallowed form, in infancy, in power, on the cross, on the right hand of the Father, coming down amid the hosts of angels. The most stupendous, the most multifarious scenes were represented in reliefs more or less bold, prominent, and vigorous, or rude and harsh. The carving now aspired to more than human beauty, or it delighted in the most hideous ugliness; majestic gentle Angels, grinning hateful sometimes half-comic Devils. But it was not only the New and the Old Testament, it was the Golden Legend also which might be read in the unexhausted language of the cathedral. Our Lady had her own chapels for her own special votaries, and toward the East, behind the altar, the place of honour. Not only were there the twelve Apostles, the four Evangelists, the Martyrs, the four great doctors of the Latin Church, each in his recognised form, and with his peculiar symbol,—the whole edifice swarmed with Saints within and without, on the walls, on the painted windows, over the side altars. For now the mystery was so awful that it might be administered more near to the common eye, upon the altar in every succursal chapel which lined the building: it was secure in its own sanctity. There were the Saints local, national, or those especially to whom the building was dedicated; and the celestial hierarchy of the Areopagite, with its ascending orders, and conventional forms, the winged seraph, the cherubic face. The whole in its vastness and intricacy was to the outward sense and to the imagination what Scholasticism was to the intellect, an enormous effort, a waste and prodigality of

power, which confounded and bewildered rather than enlightened; at the utmost awoke vague and indistinct emotion.

But even therein was the secret of the imperishable power of the Gothic cathedrals. Their hieroglyphic language, in its more abstruse terms, became obsolete and unintelligible; it was a purely hierarchical dialect; its meaning, confined to the hierarchy, gradually lost its signification even to them. But the cathedrals themselves retired as it were into more simple and more commanding majesty, into the solemn grandeur of their general effect. They rested only on the wonderful boldness and unity of their design, the richness of their detail. Content now to appeal to the indelible, inextinguishable kindred and affinity of the human heart to grandeur, grace, and beauty, the countless statues from objects of adoration became architectural ornaments. So the mediæval churches survive in their influence on the mind and the soul of man. Their venerable antiquity comes in some sort in aid of their innate religiousness. It is that about them which was temporary and accessory, their hierarchical character, which has chiefly dropped from them and become obsolete. They are now more absolutely and exclusively churches for the worship of God. As the mediæval pageantry has passed away, or shrunk into less imposing forms, the one object of worship, Christ, or God in Christ, has taken more full and absolute possession of the edifice. Where the service is more simple, as in our York, Durham, or Westminster, or even where the old faith prevails, in Cologne, in Antwerp, in Strasburg, in Rheims, in Bourges, in Rouen, it has become more popular, less ecclesiastical: everywhere the priest is now, according to the common sentiment, more the Minister, less the half-divinised Mediator. And thus all that is the higher attribute and essence of Christian architecture retains its nobler, and in the fullest sense, its religious power. The Gothic cathedral can hardly be contemplated without awe, or entered without devotion.

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIAN SCULPTURE.

Christian Sculpture.

DURING almost all this period Christian Sculpture was accessary, or rather subsidiary to architecture. The use of Statues was to ornament and enrich the building. In her Western conquests, under Justinian, Constantinople sent back no sculptors; only architects with her domes, and her Greek cross, and her splendid workers in mosaic. The prodigality with which Constantine, as Rome of old, despoiled the world to adorn his new city with ancient works of sculpture, put to shame, it should seem, rather than awoke the emulation of Christian Art. We have seen Constantine usurp the form, the attributes, even the statue, of Apollo.[a] We have heard even Theodosius do homage to art, and spare statues of heathen deities for their exquisite workmanship. Christian historians, Christian poets, lavish all their eloquence, and all their glowing verse on the treasures of ancient art. They describe with the utmost admiration the gods, the mythological personages, those especially that crowded the baths of Zeuxippus;[b] which perished with the old Church of St. Sophia in the fatal conflagration in the fifth year of Justinian. In the Lausus stood the unrivalled Cnidian Venus of Praxiteles; the Samian Juno of Lysippus;[c] the ivory Jove of Phidias. The whole city was thronged with statues of the Emperors and their Queens, of Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, Arcadius, and Honorius, Justinian, Leo, Theodora, Pulcheria, Eudocia.[d] It is even said that there were marble statues of Arius, Macedonius,

[a] History of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 408; iii. 494. The whole passage.

[b] Cedrenus, v. i. p. 648, Ed. Bonn. The Ecphrasis of Christodorus, is a Poem, for its age, of much spirit and beauty. See especially the descriptions of Hecuba and of Homer.—Jacobs, Anthologia.

[c] So at least says Cedrenus, p. 564.

[d] All these will be found in the description of Constantinople by Petrus Gyllius. The work was translated by John Ball, London, 1729.

Sabellius, and Eunomius, which were exposed to filthy indignities by the orthodox Theodosius.[e] It appears not how far Sculpture had dared to embody in brass or in marble the hallowed and awful objects of Christian worship. It should seem indeed that the Iconoclastic Emperors found statues, and those statues objects of adoration, to war upon. Though in the word Iconoclast, the image-breaker, the word for image is ambiguous; still the breaking seems to imply something more destructive than the effacing pictures, or picking out mosaics: it is the dashing to pieces something hard and solid. This controversy in the second Nicene Council comprehends images of brass or stone; one of the perpetual precedents is the statue of the Redeemer said to have been raised at Paneas in Syria.[f] The carved symbolic images of the Jewish ark are constantly alleged.[g] Those are accursed who compare the images of the Lord and of the Saints to the statues of Satanic Idols.[h] If we worship stones as Gods, how do we worship the Martyrs and Apostles who broke down and destroyed idols of stone?[i] The homage paid to the statues of the Emperors was constantly urged to repel the accusation of idolatry. Yet probably statues which represented objects of Christian worship were extremely rare; and when Image-worship was restored, what may be called its song of victory, is silent as to Sculptures[k]: the Lord, the Virgin, the Angels,

[e] Gyllius, b. ii. c. xxiii.

[f] Act. Concil. Nicen. ii. A.D. 737, *ἀνδρίαντι τῷ Χριστῷ*. It was said to have been raised by the woman cured of an issue of blood, p. 14; *ἵστησαν δὲ καὶ εἰκόνα*—of a certain Saint in an oratory, p. 23.

[g] The Sculptilia in the Old Testament, p. 45.

[h] Those are anathematised—*τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως τοῖς Ξοάνοις τῶν Σατανικῶν εἰδώλων ὀνομάσαντας· σιττὰς καὶ ἁγιάς εἰκόνας τὰς ἐκ χρώματων καὶ ψήφιδος καὶ ἑτέρας ὕλης ἐπιτηδείως ἐχουσὰς ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν ἱεροῖς σκεύεσι καὶ ἐσθῆσι τοίχοις τε καὶ σανίσιν, οἴκοις τε καὶ ὁδοῖς*, p. 375. In this minute enumeration the first must be statues. The letter of Tarasius is less clear: it mentions only painting, mosaics, waxen tablets, and *σανίδες*.

[i] *Εἰ τοὺς λίθους ὡς Θεοὺς δοξάζω* (if I give really divine worship to these stones, as I am accused) *πῶς τιμῶ καὶ προσκυνῶ τοὺς μάρτυρας καὶ ἀποστόλους συντρίψαντας καὶ ἀπολίσαντας τὰ λίθινα ζώδια;*—The address of Leontius, p. 48.

[k] See the Poem in the Anthologia (*χριστιάνικα Ἐπιγράμματα*), Jacobs, i. 28.

Ἴλαμψιν ἀκτὶς τῆς ἀληθείας πάλιν
καὶ τὰς κόρας ἤμβλυνε τῶν ψευδηγόρων·
νῦξησιν εὐσεβείας, πίστωσις πλάνης·
καὶ πίστις ἐγνέθη, καὶ πλατύνεται χάρις.
Ἰδοὺ γὰρ αὖθις Χριστὸς εἰκονισμένος
λάμπει πρὸς ὕψος τῆς καθέδρας τοῦ κράτους,
καὶ τὰς σκοτεινὰς αἱρέσεις ἀνατρίπτει.
Τῆς εἰσόδου δ' ὑπερθεν, ὡς θεία πύλη,
στηλογραφεῖται, καὶ φύλαξ, ἡ παρθένος,
ἃ αὖ δὲ καὶ πρόπυργος, ὡς πλανοτρόποι
σὺν τοῖς συνεργοῖς ἱστορεῦνται πλησίον·
κύκλῳ δὲ πάντος οἷα φρουροὶ τοῦ δόμου,
νοὶς (Angeli) μαθηταί, μάρτυρες, θυητόλοι,
ὅθεν καλοῦμεν Χριστοτρίκλινον νέον,

Saints, Martyrs, Priesthood, take their place over the portal entrance; but shining in colours to blind the eyes of the heretics. To the keener perception of the Greeks there may have arisen a feeling that in its more rigid and solid form the Image was more near to the Idol. At the same time, the art of Sculpture and casting in bronze was probably more degenerate and out of use; at all events, it was too slow and laborious to supply the demand of triumphant zeal in the restoration of the persecuted Images. There was therefore a tacit compromise; nothing appeared but painting, mosaics, engraving on cups and chalices, embroidery on vestments. The renunciation of Sculpture grew into a rigid passionate aversion. The Greek at length learned to contemplate that kind of more definite and full representation of the Deity or the Saints with the aversion of a Jew or a Mohammedan.[m] Yet some admiration for ancient Sculpture of heathen objects, lingered behind in the Grecian mind. In his vehement and bitter lamentation over the destruction of all the beautiful works of bronze by the Crusaders in the Latin Conquest of Constantinople, Nicetas is not content with branding the avarice which cast all these wonderful statues into the melting pot to turn them into money; he denounces the barbarians as dead to every sense of beauty,[n] who remorselessly destroyed the colossal Juno, the equestrian Bellerophon, the Hercules; as regardless of the proud reminiscences of old Rome, they melted the swine and the wolf which suckled Romulus and Remus, and the ass with its driver

Christian Sculpture proscribed in the East.

τὸν πρὶν λαχόντα κλήσεως χρυσωνόμου,
ὡς τὸν θρόνον ἔχοντα Χριστοῦ κυρίου,
Χριστοῦ δὲ μητρὸς, Χριστοκηρύκων τύπους,
καὶ τοῦ σοφουργοῦ Μιχαὴλ τὴν εἰκόνα.

This was Michael the Drunkard, son of Theodora (Jacobs' Note). Compare vol. ii. p. 202, where the word "*statue*" should be omitted. Was the Painting of Michael the Archangel, celebrated in two other Epigrams, erected on this occasion?—(Pp. 12, 13.)

Ἄσκοπον ἀγγελίαρχον, ἀσώματον εἰδεῖ μορφῆς·
ἃ μέγα τολμήεις κηρὸς ἀπεπλάσατο·
οἶδε δὲ τέχνη
χρώμασι πορθμεῦσαι τὴν φρενὸς ἐκείνην.

[m] Nicephorus Critopulos, a late writer, says, τούτων οὖν εἴκονας ἡ ἐκκλήσια ἐποίει οὐ γλυπτὰς οὐδὲ λαξευτὰς ἀλλὰ γραπτὰς μόνον, quoted in Suicer, who speaks justly of "Imagines sculptas et excisas, ipsius que Dei representationes apud Græcos etiamnum ignotas." The exquisite small carvings in ivory were permitted seemingly in all ages of Byzantine art.

[n] Nicetas Choniata de Signis, οἱ τοῦ καλοῦ ἀνέραστοι οὗτοι βάρβαροι. Some called the equestrian Bellerophon Joshua the Son of Nun. This is remarkable.

set up by Augustus after the battle of Actium; they feared not to seize the magic eagle of Apollonius of Tyana. Even the exquisite Helen, who set the world in arms, notwithstanding her unrivalled beauty and her fame, touched not, and did not soften those iron-hearted, those unlettered savages, who could not read, who had never heard of Homer.°

Sculpture in the West.

The West might seem to assert its more bold and free image worship by its unrestrained and prodigal display of religious sculpture; still it was mostly sculpture decorative, or forming an integral part of Architecture. It was not the ordinary occupation of Sculpture to furnish the beautiful single statue of marble or of bronze. Rome had no succession of Emperors, whose attribute and privilege it was to a late period in Constantinople to have their image set up for the homage of the people, and so to keep alive the art of carving marble or casting bronze. But gradually in the Romanesque, as in the later Gothic Architecture, the west front of the Churches might seem, as it were, the chosen place for sacred Images. Not merely did the Saviour and the Virgin appear as the Guardian Deities over the portal, gradually the Host of Heaven, Angels, Apostles, Martyrs, Evangelists, Saints spread over the whole façade. They stood on pedestals or in niches; reliefs more or less high found their pannels in the walls; the heads of the portal arches were carved in rich designs; the semicircle more or less round or pointed, above the level line of the door, was crowded with sacred scenes, or figures. But in all these, as in other statues if such there were, within the Churches, Christian modesty required that human or divinised figures must be fully clad. Sculpture, whose essence is form, found the naked human figure almost under proscription. There remained nothing for the sculptor's art but the attitude, the countenance, and the more or less graceful fall of the drapery; all this, too, in strict subordination to the architectural effect; with this he must be content, and not aspire to centre on himself and his work the

° Of Helen he says—ἆρ' ἐμείλιξε τοὺς βαρβάροις καὶ τίλιον ἀναλφαβήτοις ἀνηγνώσις δυσμειλίκτους; ἆρ' ἐμάλθαξε τοὺς σιδηρόφρονας; καὶ γνῶσις τῶν ἐπὶ σοὶ ραψῳδηθέντων ἐκείνων . . . . . ἄλλως τι τοῦ παρὰ ἀγραμμάτοις ἐπῶν;—Edit. Bonn., p. 863.

admiring and long dwelling eye.[p] The Sculptor, in general, instead of the votary and master of a high and independent art, became the workman of the architect; a step or two higher than the carver of the capital, the moulding, the knosp or the finial.[q] In some respects the progress of Gothic, though it multiplied images to infinity, was unfavourable; as the niches became loftier and narrower, the Saints rose to disproportionate stature, shrunk to meagre gracility, they became ghosts in long shrouds. Sometimes set on high upon pinnacles, or crowded in hosts as at Milan, they lost all distinctness, and were absolutely nothing more than architectural ornaments.

All, no doubt, even as regards sculptural excellence, is not equally rude, barbarous, or barren. So many artists could not be employed, even under conventional restrictions, on subjects so suggestive of high and solemn emotion; men themselves under deep devotional feelings; without communicating to the hard stone some of their own conceptions of majesty, awefulness, serenity, grace, beauty. The sagacious judgement among the crowds of figures in front of our Cathedrals may discern some of the nobler attributes of Sculpture, dignity, expression, skilful and flowing disposition of drapery, even while that judgement is not prompted and kindled by reverential religiousness, as is often the case, to imagine that in the statue which is in the man's own mind. In the reliefs, if there be more often confusion, grotesqueness, there is not seldom vigour and distinctness, skilful grouping, an artistic representation of an impressive scene. The animals are almost invariably hard, conventional emblems not drawn from nature; but the human figure, if without anatomical precision, mostly unnecessary when so amply swathed in drapery, in its outline and proportions is at times nobly developed. Yet, on the whole, the indulgence usually claimed and readily conceded for the state of art at the period, is in itself the unanswerable testimony to its imperfection and barbarism. Christian Sculpture must produce, as it did afterwards produce, something greater, with John of Bologna and

[p] Even of the Crucifix Schnaase has justly said, "Gleichzeitig änderte sich auch die Tracht des Gekreuzigten; die lange Tunica, welche früher den Körper ganz verhüllte, wird schon in 12 Jahr. kurzer, im 13 und noch allgemeiner in 14 vertritt ein Schurz um die Hüfte ihre Stelle."—iv. p. 390.

[q] It is to be observed that the Statues were only intended to be seen in front.

Michael Angelo, or it must be content to leave to heathen Greece the uncontested supremacy in this wonderful art. Sculpture, in truth, must learn from ancient art those elementary lessons which Christianity could not teach, which it dared not, or would not venture to teach; it must go back to Greece for that revelation of the inexhaustible beauties of the human form which had long been shrouded from the eyes of men. The anthropomorphism of the Greeks grew out of, and at the same time fully developed the physical perfection of the human body. That perfection was the model, the ideal of the Sculptor. The gods in stature, force, majesty, proportion, beauty, were but superhuman men. To the Christian there was still some disdain of the sensual perishable body; with monasticism, that disdain grew into contempt; it must be abased, macerated, subdued. The utmost beauty which it could be allowed was patience, meekness, gentleness, lowliness. To the fully developed athlete succeeded the emaciated saint. The man of sorrows, the form "of the servant," still lingered in the Divine Redeemer; the Saint must be glorified in meekness; the Martyr must still bear the sign and expression of his humiliation. The whole age might seem determined to disguise and conceal, even if not to debase, the human form, the Sculptor's proper domain and study, in its free vigorous movement or stately tranquillity. The majestic Prelate was enveloped in his gorgeous and cumbrous habiliments, which dazzled with their splendour; the strong, tall, noble Knight was sheathed in steel; even the Monk or Friar was swathed in his coarse ungainly dress and cowl. Even for its draperies reviving Sculpture must go back to the antique.

Monumental Sculpture.

There was one branch, however, of the art—Monumental Sculpture—which assumed a peculiar character and importance under Christianity, and aspired to originality and creativeness. Even Monumental Sculpture, in the Middle Ages, was in some degree architectural. The tomb upon which, the canopy under which, lay the King, the Bishop, or the Knight, or the Lady, was as carefully and as elaborately wrought as the slumbering image. In the repose, in the expression of serene sleep, in the lingering majesty, gentleness, or holiness of counte-

nance of these effigies there is often singular beauty.[r] Repose is that in which Sculpture delights; the repose, or the collapsing into rest, of a superhuman being, after vigorous exertion; nothing, therefore, could be more exquisitely suited to the art than the peace of the Christian sleeping after a weary life, sleeping in conscious immortality, sleeping to awake to a calm and joyful resurrection. Even the drapery, for Sculpture must here, above all, submit to conceal the form in drapery, is at rest. But Monumental Sculpture did not confine itself to the single recumbent figure. The first great Christian Sculptor, Nicolo Pisano, in the former part of the 14th century, showed his earliest skill and excellence in the reliefs round the tomb of St. Dominic at Bologna.[s] It is remarkable that the first great Christian Sculptor was a distinguished architect. Nicolo Pisano had manifestly studied at Rome and elsewhere the remains of ancient art; they guide and animate, but only guide and animate his bold and vigorous chisel. Christian in form and sentiment, some of his figures have all the grace and ease of Grecian Art. Nicolo Pisano stood, indeed, alone almost as much in advance of his successors, as of those who had gone before.[t] Nor did Nicolo Pisano confine himself to Monumental Sculpture. The spacious pulpits began to offer pannels which might be well filled up with awful admonitory reliefs. In those of Pisa and Sienna the master, in others his disciples and scholars, displayed their vigour and power. There was one scene which permitted them to reveal the naked form—the Last Judgement. Men, women, rose unclad from their tombs. And it is singular to remark how Nicolo Pisano seized all that was truly noble

[r] Among the noblest tombs in Italy are that of Benedict XI. at Perugia, by John, son of Nicolo Pisano; of Gregory X., by Margaritone, at Arezzo; of John XXIII., at Florence, by Donatello. Our own Cathedrals have noble specimens of somewhat ruder work—the Edward III., Queen Philippa, and Richard II. in Westminster Abbey.

[s] See on Nicolo Pisano, Cicognara Storia de Scultura, v. III, with the illustrative Prints. In Count Cicognara's engravings the transition from the earliest masters to Nicolo Pisano, is to be transported to another age, to overleap centuries.

[t] Count Cicognara writes thus: all that I have seen, and all the Count's illustrations, confirm his judgement:—Tutto ciò che lo aveva proceduto era multo al di sotto de lui, e per elevarsi ad un tratto fu forza d'un genio straordinario, p. 223. E le opere degli scolari di Niccolo ci sembreranno talvolta della mano de suoi predecessori, p. 234. Guilds of Sculpture now arose at Sienna and elsewhere.

and sculptural. The human form appears in infinite variety of bold yet natural attitude, without the grotesque distortions, without the wild extravagances, the writhing, the shrinking from the twisting serpents, the torturing fiends, the monsters preying upon the vitals. Nicolo wrought before Dante, and maintained the sobriety of his art. Later Sculpture and Painting must aspire to represent all that Poetry had represented, and but imperfectly represented in words: it must illustrate Dante.

But in the first half of the fifteenth century, during the Popedom of Eugenius and Nicolas V., Sculpture broke loose from its architectural servitude, with Donatello, and with Brunelleschi (if Brunelleschi had not turned aside and devoted himself exclusively to architectural art) even with Ghiberti, asserted its dignity and independence as a creative art.[u] The Evangelist or the Saint began to stand alone trusting to his own majesty, not depending on his position as part of an harmonious architectural design. The St. Mark and the St. George of Donatello are noble statues, fit to take their place in the public squares of Florence. In his fine David, after the death of Goliath, above all in his Judith and Holofernes, Donatello took a bolder flight. In that masterly work (writes Vasari) the simplicity of the dress and countenance of Judith manifest her lofty spirit and the aid of God; as in Holofernes wine, sleep, and death are expressed in his limbs; which, having lost their animating spirit, are cold and failing. Donatello succeeded so well in portrait statuary, that to his favourite female statue he said — Speak! speak! His fame at Padua was unrivalled. Of him it was nobly said, either Donatello was a prophetic anticipation of Buonarotti, or Donatello lived again in Buonarotti.

Ghiberti's great work was the gates of the Baptistery at Florence, deserving, in Michael Angelo's phrase, to be called the Gates of Heaven; and it was from their own copiousness, felicity, and unrivalled sculptural designs, that these gates demanded and obtained their fame.

[u] Donatello born 1383, died 1466; Brunelleschi 1398; Ghiberti 1378, died 1455. I ought perhaps to have added Jacobo della Quercia, who worked rather earlier at Bologna and Sienna. Read in Vasari the curious contest between Donatello and Brunelleschi, in which Donatello owned that while himself made an unrivalled Contadino, Brunelleschi made a Christ. See Vasari on the works of Donatello.

CHAPTER X.

CHRISTIAN PAINTING.

PAINTING, which, with architecture and music, attained its perfect and consummate excellence under the influence of Latin Christianity, had yet to await the century which followed the pontificate of Nicolas V. before it culminated, through Francia and Perugino, in Michael Angelo, Leonardo, Raffaelle, Correggio, and Titian. It received only its first impulse from mediæval Christianity; its perfection was simultaneous with the revival of classical letters and ancient art. Religion had in a great degree to contest the homage, even of its greatest masters, with a dangerous rival. Some few only of its noblest professors were at that time entirely faithful to Christian art. But all these, as well as the second Teutonic school, Albert Durer and his followers, are beyond our bounds.[a] Christian Painting.

Of the great Epochs of Painting, therefore, two only, preparatory to the Perfect Age, belong to our present history: I. That which is called (I cannot but think too exclusively) the Byzantine period; II. That initiatory branch of Italian art which I will venture to name, from the subjects it chose, the buildings which it chiefly adorned, and the profession of many of the best masters who practised it, the Cloistral epoch. The second period reached its height in Frà Angelico da Fiesole.[b]

It is impossible to doubt that Painting, along with the conservation of some of its technical processes, and with

[a] It were unwise and presumptuous (since our survey here also must be brief and rapid) to enter into the artistic and antiquarian questions which have been agitated and discussed with so much knowledge and industry by modern writers, especially (though I would not pass over Lanzi, still less the new Annotated Edition of Vasari) by the Baron Rumohr (Italienische Forschungen), my friend M. Rio (Art Chrétienne), by Kugler and his all-accomplished Translators, and by Lord Lindsay (Christian Art). In my summary I shall endeavour to indicate the sources from which it can be amplified, justified, or filled up.

[b] Born 1387—became a Dominican 1407.

some traditionary forms, and the conventional representation of certain scenes in the Scriptural History or in Legends, preserved certain likenesses, as they were thought to be, of the Saviour and his Apostles and Martyrs, designated by fixed and determinate lineaments, as well as by their symbolical attributes. The paintings in the Catacombs at Rome show such forms and countenances in almost unbroken descent till nearly two centuries after the conversion of Constantine.[c] The history of Iconoclasm has recorded how such pictures were in the East religiously defended, religiously destroyed, religiously restored; how the West, in defiance, as it were, and contempt of the impious persecutor, seemed to take a new impulse, and the Popes of the Iconoclastic age lavished large sums on decorations of their churches by paintings, if not by sculpture. No doubt, also, many monk-artists fled from the sacrilegious East to practise their holy art in the safe and quiet West. Even a century or more before this, it is manifest that Justinian's conquest of Italy, as it brought the Byzantine form of architecture, so it brought the Byzantine skill, the modes and usages of the subsidiary art. The Byzantine painting of that age lives in the mosaics (the more durable process of that, in all its other forms, too perishable art), on the walls of the Church of San Vitale, and in S. Apollinaris, in Ravenna, and in other Italian cities under Greek influence. These mosaics maintain the indefeasible character[d] of Greek Christianity. The vast, majestic image of the Saviour broods indeed over the place of honour, above the high altar; but on the chancel walls, within the Sanctuary, are on one side the Emperor, Theodora on the other, not Saints or Martyrs, not Bishops or Popes. It cannot be argued, from the survival of these

[c] Much has been done during the last few years in the Catacombs. The great French Publication, by M. Louis Perret, is beautiful; if it be as true as beautiful, by some inexplicable means, some of the paintings have become infinitely more distinct and brilliant, since I saw them some thirty years ago. It is unfortunate that the passion for early art, and polemic passion, are so busy in discovering what they are determined to find, that sober, historical, and artistic criticism is fairly bewildered. There are two important questions yet to be settled: when did the Catacombs cease to be places of burial? (what is the date of the later cemeteries of Rome?) when did the Catacomb Chapels cease to be places not of public worship, but of fervent private devotion? To the end of that period, whenever it was, they would continue to be embellished by art, and therefore the difficulty of affixing dates to works of art is increased.

[d] On the Mosaics of Leo III., Anastasius in vit. compare Schnaase, Bildende Kunst, iii. p. 505.

more lasting works, that mosaic predominated over other modes of painting, either in Constantinople or in the Byzantinised parts of the West. But as it was more congenial to the times, being a work more technical and mechanical, so no doubt it tended to the hard, stiff, conventional forms which in general characterise Byzantine art, as well as to their perpetuity. The traditions of painting lived on. The descriptions of the paintings on the walls of the Romans [e] by the poets of the fourth or fifth centuries bear striking resemblance to those of the poets of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, of the works which adorned Aix-la-Chapelle and the Palace of Ingelheim. How far, during all this period, it was old Roman art, or Roman art modified by Byzantine influences, may seem a question unimportant to general history, and probably incapable of a full solution. We must confine ourselves to that which is specially and exclusively Christian art.

Of all Christian painting during this long period, from the extinction of Paganism to the rise of Italian art (its first dawn at the beginning of the twelfth century, brightening gradually to the time of Nicolas V.), the one characteristic is that its object was worship, not art. It was a mute preaching, which addressed not the refined and intelligent, but the vulgar of all ranks.[f] Its utmost aim was to awaken religious emotion, to suggest religious thought. It was, therefore—more, no doubt, in the East than in the West—rigidly traditional, conventional, hierarchical. Each form had its special type, from which it was dangerous, at length forbidden, to depart. Each scene, with its grouping and arrangement, was consecrated by long reverence; the

[e] In the Castle Villa of Pontius Leontius on the Garonne, in the verses of Sidonius Apollonius, Carm. xxii., were painted on one part scenes from the Mithridatic war waged by Lucullus; on the other the opening Chapters of the Old Testament. Recutitorum primordia Judæorum. Sidonius seems to have been surprised at the splendour and duration of the colours:

Perpetuum pictura micat, nec tempore longo
Depreciata suas turpant pigmenta figuras.—
C. 202.

Fortunatus mentions wood-carving as rivalling painting,

Quos pictura solet, ligna dedere jocos.

See Ermondus Nigellus, for the paintings at Ingelheim.

[f] See the Greek Epigram on the painting of Michael the Archangel.

Ὡς ἑρασὺ μορφῶσαι τὸν ἀσώματον· ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰκὼν
ἰς νοερὴν ἀνάγει μνῆσιν ἑπουρανίων.

Jacobs, p. 14.

This whole series of Epigrams was inscribed, no doubt, either under paintings, or under illuminations in MSS.

artist worked in the trammels of usage; he had faithfully to transmit to others that which he had received, and no more. Invention was proscribed; novelty might incur the suspicion almost of heresy—at all events it would be an unintelligible language. Symbolism without a key, it would either jar on sacred associations, or perplex, or offend.[g]

From the earliest period there had been two traditional conceptions of that which was the central figure of Christian art, the Lord himself. One represented the Saviour as a beautiful youth, beardless—a purely ideal image, typical perhaps of the rejuvenescence of mankind in Christ.[h] Such was the prevailing, if not the exclusive conception of the Redeemer in the West. In the East, the Christ is of mature age, of tall stature, meeting eye-brows, beautiful eyes, fine-formed nose, curling hair, figure slightly bowed, of delicate complexion, dark beard (it is sometimes called wine-coloured beard), his face, like his mother's, of the colour of wheat, long fingers, sonorous voice, and sweet eloquence (how was this painted?),[i] most gentle, quiet, long-suffering, patient, with all kindred graces, blending the manhood with the attributes of God. In the fabulous letter ascribed to Lentulus, descriptive of the person of the Redeemer, this conception is amplified into still higher beauty.[k] The truth seems to be that this youthful Western

[g] Kugler has the quotation from the Acts of the Council of Nice, which show that the Byzantine painters worked according to a law, Διάτυπος. But M. Didron's work, Manuel d'Iconographie Chrétienne, at once proved the existence, and in fact published this law, according to which, in his vivid words—L'artiste Grec est asservi aux traditions comme l'animal a son instinct, il fait une figure comme l'hirondelle son nid ou l'abeille sa ruche, p. iv. The Greek Painter's Guide, which fills the greater part of M. Didron's book, gives all the rules of technical procedure and design.

[h] Didron, Hist. de Dieu, and a translation published by Bohn, p. 249. But compare the two heads from the Catacombs, engraved in the Translation of Kugler. These, *if both indeed represent the Redeemer*, and *are of the period supposed*, approximate more nearly to the Eastern type.

[i] Didron, p. 248, from John of Damascus. M. Didron has fully investigated the subject, but with an utter and total want of historical criticism. He accepts this controversial tract of John of Damascus (he does not seem to read Greek) as an authority for all the old Legends of Abgarus of Edessa, and the likenesses of Christ painted or carved by order of Constantine.

[k] Compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. p. 507, for the translation of Lentulus. I am astounded at finding in a book like Kugler's (the English translation especially having undergone such supervision) the assertion that this letter of Lentulus may "possibly be assigned to the third century," p. 12. What evidence is there of its existence before the ninth or even

type was absolutely and confessedly ideal; it was symbolic of the calm, gentle, young, world-renewing religion. In one place the Christ seems standing on the mystic mountain from whence issue the four rivers of Paradise, the Gospels of everlasting life.[m] The tradition of the actual likeness was Eastern (it was unknown to Augustine), and this tradition in all its forms, at the second Council of Nicea, and in the writings of John of Damascus, became historical fact. Though at that time there was not much respect for Scripture, or probability, yet the youthful, almost boyish type of the Western Church, if it still survived, was so directly at issue with the recorded age of Jesus, that even in the West the description in John of Damascus, embellished into the bolder fiction of Lentulus, the offspring, and not the parent of the controversy, found general acceptance in the West as in the East.[n]

But the triumph of Iconoclasm had been a monastic triumph—a triumph for which the monks had suffered, and admired each other's martyr sufferings. Gradually misery and pain became the noblest, dearest images; the joyous and elevating, if still lowly, emotions of the older faith, gave place altogether to gloom, to dreary depression. Among one class of painters, the monks of St. Basil, there was a reaction to absolute blackness and ugliness. The Saviour became a dismal, macerated, self-tortured monk. Light vanished from his brow; gentleness from his features; calm, serene majesty from his attitude.

Monks of St. Basil. Black School.

Another change, about the tenth century, came over the image of the Lord. It was no longer the mild Redeemer, but the terrible Judge, which painting strove to represent. As the prayers, the hymns, gradually declined from the calm, if not jubilant tone of

Change in the tenth century.

the eleventh century? It is a strange argument, the only one that I can find, that the description resembles some of the earliest so-called Portraits of the Saviour, even one in the Catacombs. It is clear that it was unknown to the early Fathers, especially to St. Augustine. If known, it must have been adduced at the Council of Nice, and by John of Damascus. But even the fable had not been heard of at that time. I have not the least doubt that it was a fiction growing out of the controversy.

[m] Didron, p. 251.

[n] Hence too the Veronica, the vera *ικων*, a singular blending of Greek and Latin fiction and language.

the earliest Church, the song of deliverance from hopeless unawakening death, the triumph in the assurance of eternal life,—so the youthful symbol of the new religion, the form which the Godhead by its indwelling, beautified and glorified, the still meek, if commanding look of the Redeemer, altogether disappeared, or ceased to be the most ordinary and dominant character: he became the King of tremendous majesty, before whom stood shuddering, guilty, and resuscitated mankind.[o] The Cross, too, by degrees became the Crucifix.[p] The image of the Lord on the Cross was at first meek, though suffering; pain was represented, but pain overcome by patience; it was still a clothed form, with long drapery. By degrees it was stripped to ghastly nakedness; agony became the prevailing, absorbing tone. The intensity of the suffering strove at least to subdue the sublime resignation of the sufferer; the object of the artist was to wring the spectator's heart with fear and anguish, rather than to chasten with quiet sorrow or elevate with faith and hope; to aggravate the sin of man, rather than display the mercy of God. Painting vied with the rude sculpture which arose in many quarters, (sculpture more often in wood than in stone,) and by the red streaming blood, and the more vivid expression of pain in the convulsed limbs, deepened the effect; till, at last, that most hideous and repulsive object, the painted Crucifix, was offered to the groaning worship of mankind.[q]

The Crucifix.

But this was only one usage, though the dominant one—one school of Byzantine art. Painting, both at Constantinople and in Italy, was more true to its own dignity, and

[o] See the observations of Schnaase above, p. 599, note.

[p] Schnaase says that the first Byzantine representation of the Crucifixion is in a Codex of the time of Basil the Macedonian (867-886), iii. p. 216.

[q] The curious and just observations of M. Didron should be borne in mind in the History of Christian Painting. "Nous dirons à cette occasion, qu'il n'y aurait rien de plus intéressant qu'à signaler dans l'ordre chronologique les sujets de la Bible, du Martyrologe, et de la Légende, que les différentes époques ont surtout affectionnés. Dans les catacombes il n'y a pas une scène de martyre, mais une foule de sujets relatifs à la résurrection. Les Martyrs et les jugements derniers, avec les représentations des supplices de l'enfer, abondent pendant le moyen âge. A partir de la renaissance à nos jours c'est la douceur, et, disons le mot, la sentimentalité, qui dominent; alors on adopte la bénédiction des petits enfants, et les dévotions qui ont le cœur pour l'objet. Il faut chercher la raison de tous ces faits."—Didron, Manuel d'Iconographie, p. 182, note. The reason is clear enough.

to Christianity. It still strove to maintain nobler conceptions of the God-Man, and to embody the Divinity glorifying the flesh in which it dwelt. In this respect, no doubt, the more durable form of the art would be highly conservative; it prevented deeper degeneration. If other painting might dare to abrogate the tradition or the law, Mosaic would be more unable, or more unwilling, to venture upon dangerous originality. It would be a perpetual protest against the encroachments of ugliness and deformity: its attribute, its excellences being brilliancy, strongly contrasted diversity and harmony of rich colouring, it would not consent to darken itself to a dismal monotony. Yet Mosaic can hardly become high art; it is too artificial, too mechanical. It may have, if wrought from good models, an imposing effect; but the finely-evanescent outline, the true magic of colouring, the depth, the light and shade, the half-tints, the blending and melting into each other of hues in their finest gradations, are beyond its powers. The interlaying of small pieces cannot altogether avoid a broken, stippled, spotty effect: it cannot be alive. As it is strong and hard, we can tread it under foot on a pavement, and it is still bright as ever; but in the church, the hall, or the chamber, it is an enamelled wall—but it is a wall;[r] splendid decoration, but aspiring to none of the loftier excellences of art. But throughout this period faithful conservation was in truth the most valuable service. Mosaic fell in with the tendency to conventionalism, aided in strengthening conventionalism into irresistible law.[s]

Thus Byzantine art, and Roman art in the West, so far as independent of Byzantine art, went on with its perpetual supply of images, relieved by a blazing golden ground, and with the most glowing colours, but in general stiff, rigid,

[r] Kugler (p. 20) is almost inclined to suspect that historic painting on *walls* in Mosaic arose under Christian influences in the fourth century. It was before on pavements.

[s] The account of the earlier Mosaics, and the description of those at Rome and at Ravenna, in Kugler's Handbook, is full and complete. Kugler, it is to be observed, ascribes those in San Vitale, and other works of Justinian and his age in the West, to Roman, not Byzantine Art. This, perhaps, can hardly be determined. The later, at S. Apollinaris in Ravenna, at S. Prassede, and other Churches in Rome, are Byzantine in character: on those of Venice Kugler is fuller. The Art was lost in Italy at the close of the ninth century, to revive again more free and Italian in the eleventh and twelfth.

shapeless, expressionless. Worship still more passionate multiplied its objects; and those objects it was content to receive according to the established pattern. The more rich and gaudy, the more welcome the offering to the Saint or to the Deity, the more devout the veneration of the worshipper. This character—splendid colouring, the projection of the beautiful but too regular face, or the hard, but not entirely unpliant form, by the rich background—prevails in all the subordinate works of art in East and West—enamels, miniatures, illuminations in manuscripts. In these, not so much images for popular worship, as the slow work of artists dwelling with unbounded delight on their own creations, seem gradually to dawn glimpses of more refined beauty, faces, forms, more instinct with life: even the boundless luxuriance of ornament, flowers, foliage, animals, fantastic forms, would nurse the sense of beauty, and familiarise the hand with more flowing lines, and the mind with a stronger feeling for the graceful for the sake of its grace. It was altogether impossible that, during so many ages, Byzantine art, or the same kind of art in the West, where it was bound by less rigid tradition, and where the guild of painters did not pass down in such regular succession, should not struggle for freedom.[1] The religious emotions which the painter strove to excite in others would kindle in himself, and yearn after something more than the cold immemorial language. By degrees the hard, flat lineaments of the countenance would begin to quicken themselves; its long ungraceful outline

[1] I must decline the controversy how far Western Art was Byzantine. It may be possible for the fine sagacity of modern judgement to discriminate between the influences of Byzantine and old Roman Art, as regards the forms and designs of Painting. Yet considering that the Byzantine Artists of Justinian, and the Exarchs of Ravenna, to a far greater extent those who, flying from the Iconoclastic persecution, brought with them the secrets and rules of their art, were received and domiciliated in the Western Monasteries, and that in those Monasteries were chiefly preserved the traditions of the older Italian Art; that at no time was the commercial or political connection of Constantinople and the West quite broken off, and under the Othos the two Courts were cemented by marriage; that all the examples of the period are to be sought in the rigid Mosaic, in miniatures, ivories, illuminations—there must have been so much intermingling of the two streams, that such discrimination must at least be conjectural.—Compare Rio, on what he calls Romano-Christian, independent of Byzantine Art, pp. 32 *et seqq.* Rumohr, Italienische Forschungen, and Kugler. Lord Lindsay is a strong Byzantine; and see in Kugler, p. 77; but Kugler will hardly allow Byzantine Art credit for the original conception or execution of the better designs.

would be rounded into fullness and less rigid expression; the tall, straight, meagre form would swell out into something like movement; the stiff, fettered extremities separate into the attitude of life; the drapery would become less like the folds which swathe a mummy; the mummy would begin to stir with life. It was impossible but that the Saviour should relax his harsh, stern lineaments; that the child should not become more child-like; the Virgin-Mother waken into maternal tenderness.[u] This effort after emancipation would first take place in those smaller works, the miniatures, the illuminations of manuscripts.[x] On these the artist could not but work, as has been said, more at his ease; on the whole, in them he would address less numerous perhaps, but more intelligent spectators; he would be less in dread of disturbing popular superstition: and so Taste, the parent and the child of art, would struggle into being. Thus imperceptibly, thus in various quarters, these better qualities cease to be the secret indulgences, the life-long labours of the emblazoner of manuscripts, the illuminator of missals. In the higher branches of the art, the names of artists gradually begin to transpire, to obtain respect and fame; the sure sign that art is beginning, that mere technical traditionary working at images for popular worship is drawing to its close. Already the names of Guido of Sienna, Giunto of Pisa, of Cimabue, resound through Christendom. Poetry hails the birth and the youth of her sister art.

[u] Durandus, in his Rationale, i. c. 3, would confine the representation of the Saviour in Churches to three attitudes, either on his throne of glory, on the cross of shame, or in the lap of his Mother. He adds another, as teacher of the world, with the Book in his hand.—See Schnaase, iv. 387, for the various postures (ii. p. 136) of the Child in his Mother's arms. Schnaase, Geschichte der Bildende Kunst, says that about the middle of the fifth century the paintings of the Virgin Mary became more common (one has been discovered, which *is asserted to be of an earlier period*, but we have only the authority of enthusiastic admiration and polemic zeal for its age) in the Catacombs. The great Mosaic in St. Apollinare Nuovo is of the first quarter of the sixth century. Her image, as has been said, floated over the fleet of the Emperor Heraclius I.

[x] The exquisite grace of the ivory carvings from Constantinople, which show so high and pure a conception for art, as contrasted with the harsh glaring paintings, is perfectly compatible with these views. The ivories were the works of more refined artists for a more refined class. The paintings were the idols of the vulgar—a hardy, cruel, sensual vulgar; the ivories, as it were talismans, of the hardly less superstitious, but more opulent, and polished; of those who kept up, some the love of letters, some more cultivated tastes. Even the illuminations were the quiet works of the gentler and better and more civilised Monks: their love and their study of the Holy Books was the testimony and the means of their superior refinement.

Such, according to the best authorities, appears to have been the state of painting from the iconoclastic controversy throughout the darker ages. Faintly and hesitatingly at the commencement of the twelfth century,[y] more boldly and vigorously towards its close, and during the thirteenth and half the fourteenth, Italian painting rose by degrees, threw off with Giotto the last trammels of Byzantinism which had still clung around Cimabue; and at least strove after that exquisite harmony of nature and of art, which had still great progress to make before it reached its consummation. Turn from the vast, no doubt majestic Redeemer of Cimabue, which broods, with its attendant figures of the Virgin and St. John, over the high altar at Pisa, to the free creations of Giotto at Florence or Padua. Giotto was the great deliverer. Invention is no sooner free than it expatiates in unbounded variety. Nothing more moves our wonder than the indefatigable activity, the unexhausted fertility of Giotto: he is adorning Italy from the Alps to the Bay of Naples; even crossing the Alps to Avignon. His works either exist or have existed at Avignon, Milan, Verona, Padua, Ferrara, Urbino, Ravenna, Rimini, Lucca, Florence, Assisi, Rome, Gaeta, Naples.[z] Bishops, religious orders, republics, princes and potentates, kings, popes, demand his services, and do him honour. He raises at once the most beautiful tower in architecture—that of Florence—and paints the Chapel of the Arena at Padua, the Church at Assisi. Giotto was no monk, but, in its better sense, a man of the world. Profoundly religious in expression, in character, in aim; yet religious not merely as embodying all the imagery of the mediæval faith, but as prophetic, at least, if not presentient of a wider Catholicism.[a] Besides the Scriptural subjects,

Giotto, born 1276, died 1336.

[y] "Mir selbst aber ist es während vieljähriger nachforschung durchaus nicht gelungen, irgend ein Beispiel des Wiederaufstrebens und Fortshreitens der Italienischen Kunstübung auszufinden, dessen Alter den anbeginn des zwölften Jahrhunderts übersteige." — Rumohr, Italienische Forschungen, i. p. 250.

For the works of the twelfth century, Kugler, p. 94 *et seqq.* Nevertheless full eighty years elapsed before this development made any further progress, p. 98. Sculpture in relief, was earlier than Painting.

[z] Rio says, perhaps too strongly, that *all* his works at Avignon, Milan, Verona, Ferrara, Modena, Ravenna, Lucca, Gaeta, have perished, p. 65.

[a] There is great truth and beauty in the character of Giotto as drawn by Lord Lindsay (ii. p. 268). The three first paragraphs appear to me most striking and just. Lord Lindsay divides his life into four periods. I. His youth in Flo-

in which he did not entirely depart from the Byzantine or earlier arrangement, and all the more famous Legends, he opened a new world of real and of allegorical beings. The poetry of St. Francis had impersonated everything; not merely, therefore, did the life of St. Francis offer new and picturesque subjects, but the impersonations, Chastity, Obedience, Poverty, as in the hymns of St. Francis they had taken being, assumed form from Giotto. Religious led to civil allegory. Giotto painted the commonwealth of Florence. Allegory in itself is far too unobjective for art: it needs perpetual interpretation, which art cannot give; but it was a sign of the new world opening, or rather boldly thrown open, to painting by Giotto. The whole Scripture, the whole of Legend (not the old permitted forms and scenes alone), the life of the Virgin, of the Saints, of the founders of Orders, even the invisible worlds which Dante had revealed in poetry, now expanded in art. Dante, perhaps, must await Orcagna, not indeed actually to embody, but to illustrate his transmundane worlds. Italy herself hailed, with all her more powerful voices—her poets, novelists, historians—the new epoch of art in Giotto. Dante declares that he has dethroned Cimabue. "The vulgar," writes Petrarch, "cannot understand the surpassing beauty of Giotto's Virgin, before which the masters stand in astonishment." "Giotto," says Boccaccio, "imitates art to perfect illusion;" Villani describes him as transcending all former artists in the truth of nature.[b]

During the latter half of the thirteenth, and throughout the fourteenth century the whole of Italy, the churches, the monasteries, the cloisters, many of the civil buildings, were covered with paintings aspiring after, approximating to the highest art. Sienna, then in the height of her glory and prosperity, took the lead; Pisa beheld her Campo

rence and Rome, II. About A.D. 1306 in Lombardy, the Arena Chapel at Padua. III. Assisi. IV. Longer residence in Florence, North of Italy, Avignon, Naples, p. 165.—See also Mr. Ruskin's Memoir. For Giotto's remarkable Poem against voluntary poverty, see Rumohr, i. c. 9.

[b] Credette Cimabue nella pittura
Tener lo campo, ed or' ha *Giotto il grido.*

Mitto tabulam meam beatæ Virginis, operis Joeti pictoris egregii in cujus pulcritudinem ignorantes nec intelligunt, magistri autem artis stupent. Quoted by Vasari. Decameron, Giorn. vi. Nov. 5. Villani, 11, 12.

Santo peopled with the wonderful creations of Orcagna. Painting aspired to her Inferno, Purgatorio, Paradiso: Painting will strive to have her Dante.

This outburst was simultaneous with, it might seem to originate in, the wide dissemination, the ubiquitous activity, and the strong religious passion felt, propagated, kept alive in its utmost intensity by the Mendicant Orders. Strange it might appear that the Arts, the highest luxuries, if we may so speak, of religion, should be fostered, cultivated, cherished, distributed throughout Italy, and even beyond the Alps, by those who professed to reduce Christianity to more than its primitive simplicity, its nakedness of all adornment, its poverty; whose mission it was to consort with the most rude and vulgar; beggars who aspired to rank below the coarsest mendicancy; according to whose rule there could be no property, hardly a fixed residence. Strange! that these should become the most munificent patrons of art, the most consummate artists; that their cloistered palaces should be the most sumptuous in architecture, the most richly decorated by sculpture and painting; at once the workshops and the abodes of those who executed most admirably, and might seem to adore with the most intense devotion, these splendours and extravagances of religious wealth. Assisi—the birthplace of St. Francis, the poor, self-denying wanderer over the face of the earth, who hardly owned the cord which girt him, who possessed not a breviary of his own, who worshipped in the barren mountain, at best in the rock-hewn cell, whose companions were the lepers, the outcasts of human society—Assisi becomes the capital, the young, gorgeous capital of Christian Art. Perhaps in no single city of that period was such lavish expenditure made in all which was purely decorative. The Church, finished by a German architect but five years after the death of St. Francis, put to shame in its architecture, as somewhat later in the paintings of Cimabue, Simon Memmi, Giunto, Giotto, probably the noblest edifices in Rome, those in the Lombard Republics, in Pisa, Sienna, Florence, and as yet those of the capitals and cathedral cities of Transalpine Christendom. The

Mendicant Orders.

Dominicans were not far behind in their steady cultivation, and their profuse encouragement of art.[c]

Yet this fact is easy of explanation, if it has not already found its explanation in our history. There is always a vast mass of dormant religiousness in the world; it wants only to be seized, stimulated, directed, appropriated. These Orders swept into their ranks and within their walls all who yearned for more intense religion. Devout men threw themselves into the movement, which promised most boldly and succeeded most fully in satisfying the cravings of the heart. There would be many whose vocation was not that of the active preacher, or the restless missionary, or the argute schoolman. There were the calm, the gentle, the contemplative. Men who had the irresistible calling to be artists became Franciscans, or Dominicans, not because mendicancy was favourable to art, but because it awoke, and cherished, and strengthened those emotions which were to express themselves in art. Religion drove them into the cloister; the cloister and the church offered them its walls; they drew from all quarters the traditions, the technicalities of art. Being rich enough (the communities, not the individuals) to reward the best teachers or the more celebrated artists, they soon became masters of the skill, the manipulation, the rules of design, the practice of colouring. How could the wealth, so lavishly poured at their feet, be better employed than in the reward of the stranger-artist, who not only adorned their walls with the most perfect models, but whose study in the church or in the cloister was a school of instruction to the Monks themselves who aspired to be their pupils or their rivals?

The Monkish painters were masters of that invaluable treasure, time, to work their study up to perfection; there was nothing that urged to careless haste. Without labour they had their scanty but sufficient sustenance; they had no further wants. Art alternated with salutary rest, or with the stimulant of art, the religious service. Neither of these permitted the other to languish into dull apathy, or to rest in inexpressive forms or hues. No cares, no anxieties,

[c] Simon Memmi of Sienna painted the legend of St. Dominic in the Chapel of the Spaniards in Santa Maria Novella at Florence.—Vasari and Rio, p. 55.

probably not even the jealousies of art intruded on these secluded Monks; theirs was the more blameless rivalry of piety, not of success. With some, perhaps, there was a latent unconscious pride, not so much in themselves as in the fame and influence which accrued to the Order, or to the convent, which their works crowded more and more with wondering worshippers. But in most it was to disburthen, as it were, their own hearts, to express in form and colour their own irrepressible feelings. They would have worked as passionately and laboriously if the picture had been enshrined, unvisited, in their narrow cell. They worshipped their own works, not because they were their own, but because they spoke the language of their souls. They worshipped while they worked, worked that they might worship; and works so conceived and so executed (directly the fetters of conventionalism were burst and cast aside, and the technical skill acquired) could not fail to inspire the adoration of all kindred and congenial minds. Their pictures, in truth, were their religious offerings, made in single-minded zeal, with untiring toil, with patience never wearied or satisfied. If these offerings had their meed of fame, if they raised the glory or enlarged the influence and so the wealth of the Order, the simple artists were probably the last who would detect within themselves that less generous and less disinterested motive.

If the Dominicans were not inferior to the Franciscans in the generous encouragement of the art of painting, in its cultivation among their own brethren they attained higher fame. If Assisi took the lead, and almost all the best masters kindled its walls to life, the Dominican convent in Florence might boast the works of their own brother Frà Angelico. To judge from extant paintings, Angelico was the unsurpassed, if not unrivalled, model of what I presume to call the cloistral school of painting. The perfect example of his art was Frà Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole. Frà Angelico became a monk that he might worship without disturbance, and paint without reward. He left all human passions behind him; his one passion was serene devotion, not without tenderness, but the tenderness of a saint rather than of a

Frà Angelico.

man. Before he began to paint, he knelt in prayer; as he painted the sufferings of the Redeemer, he would break off in tears. No doubt, when he attained that expression of calm, unearthly holiness which distinguishes his Angels or Saints, he stood partaking in their mystic ecstacy. He had nothing of the moroseness, the self-torture of the monk; he does not seem, like later monastic painters in Italy and Spain, to have delighted in the agony of the martyrdom; it is the glorified, not the suffering, Saint which is his ideal. Of the world, it was human nature alone from which he had wrenched away his sympathies. He delights in brilliant colours; the brightest green or the gayest hues in his trees and flowers; the richest reds and blues in his draperies, with a profusion of gold. Frà Angelico is the Mystic of painting, the contemplative Mystic, living in another world, having transmuted all that he remembers of this world into a purer, holier being. But that which was his excellence was likewise his defect. It was spiritualism, exquisite and exalting spiritualism, but it was too spiritual. Painting, which represents humanity, even in its highest, holiest form, must still be human. With the passions, the sympathies and affections of Giovanni's mind had almost died away. His child is not a child, he is a cherub. The Virgin and the Mother are not blended in perfect harmony and proportion; the colder Virgin prevails; adoration has extinguished motherly love. Above all, the Redeemer fails in all Angelico's pictures. Instead of the orthodox perfect God and perfect Man, by a singular heresy the humanity is so effaced that, as the pure Divinity is unimaginable, and, unincarnate, cannot be represented, both the form and the countenance are stiffened to a cold, unmeaning abstraction. It is neither the human nature with the infused majesty and mercy of the Godhead; nor the Godhead subdued into the gentleness and patience of humanity. The God-man is neither God nor Man. Even in the celestial or beatified beings, angels or saints, exquisite, unrivalled as is their grace and beauty, the grace is not that of beings accustomed to the free use of their limbs; the beauty is not that of our atmosphere. Not merely do they want the breath of life, the motion of life, the warmth of life,

they want the truth of life, and without truth there is no consummate art. They have never really lived, never assumed the functions nor dwelt within the precincts of life. Painting having acquired in the cloister all this unworldliness, this profound devotion, this refined spirituality, must emerge again into the world to blend and balance both; first in Francia and Perugino, up to the perfect Raffaelle and Leonardo. Even the cloister in Frà Bartolomeo must take a wider flight; it must paint man, it must humanise itself that it may represent man and demand the genuine admiration of man. It is without the walls of the cloister that painting finds its unrivalled votaries, achieves its most imperishable triumphs.

Transalpine. German and Flemish art.

Transalpine Painting is no less the faithful conservator of the ancient traditions. In the German missals and books of devotion there is, throughout the earlier period, the faithful maintenance of the older forms, rich grounds, splendid colours. The walls of the older churches reveal paintings in which there is at least aspiration after higher things, some variety of design, some incipient grace and nobleness of form. The great hierarchical cities on the Rhine seem to take the lead. William of Cologne and Master Stephen seem as if they would raise up rivals in Teutonic to Italian art. Above all, at the close of this period, about contemporary with Angelico da Fiesole, the Flemish Van Eycks, if not by the invention, by the perfection of oil-painting, gave an impulse of which it is difficult to calculate the importance. Those painters of the rich commercial cities of the Low Countries might seem as deeply devout in their conceptions as the cloistral school of Italy, yet more human as living among men, nobler in their grouping, nobler in their dresses and draperies; and already in their backgrounds anticipating that truth and reality of landscape which was hereafter to distinguish their country. In this the later Flemish painters rise as much above the Van Eycks as Raffaelle and Leonardo above their predecessors. But Teutonic might seem as if it would vie for the palm of Christian painting.[d]

[d] Hubert Van Eyck, born about 1366, died 1426. John Van Eyck, born about 1400, died 1445.—See for German Painting the Translation of Kugler, by Sir Edmund Head. On the Van Eycks, Waagen's Dissertation.

The works of Nicolas V. in letters and in arts have ended our survey of these two great departments of Christian influence, and summed up the account of Latin Christendom. The papacy of Nicolas V. closed the age of mediæval letters; it terminated, at least in Italy, if Brunelleschi had not already closed it, the reign of mediæval architecture.[6] In painting, by his munificent patronage of that which was then the highest art, but which was only the harbinger of nobler things to come, the pontificate of Nicolas marked the transition period from the ancient to the modern world.

But Nicolas V. was only a restorer, and a restorer not in the hierarchical character, of the mediæval architecture. That architecture had achieved its great works, Strasburg, all that was to rise, till the present day, of Cologne, Antwerp, Rheims, Bruges, Amiens, Chartres, St. Ouen at Rouen, Notre Dame at Paris, our own Westminster, York, Salisbury, Lincoln. This great art survived in its creative power, only as it were, at the extremities of Latin Christendom. It had even passed its gorgeous epoch, called in France the Flamboyant; it was degenerating into luxury and wantonness; it had begun to adorn for the sake of adornment. But Rome was still faithful to Rome; her architecture would not condescend to Teutonic influence. That which is by some called Christian architecture, as has been said, was to the end almost a stranger in the city still acknowledged as the capital of Christendom.[8] Rome at least, if not Italy, was still holding aloof from that which was the strength of Rome and of Latin Christendom—Mediævalism; Nicolas V., as it were, accomplished the divorce. In him Rome repudiated the whole of what are called the Dark Ages. Rome began the revival which was to be in the end the ruin of her supremacy.

[6] Two sentences of Vasari show the revolution arrived at and taught by that great Architect, who boasted to have raised the majestic cupola of Florence. "Solo l'intento suo era l'architettura che gia era spenta, dico gli ordini antichi *buoni*, e non la *Tedesca e barbara* la quale molto si usava nel suo tempo.*** E aveva in se due concetti grandissimi; l' uno era il tornare al luce la buona architettura, credendo egli, ritrovandola non lasciare manco memoria di se, che fatto si aveva Cimabue e Giotto; l'altro di trovar modo, se é si potesse, a voltare la cupola di S. Maria del Fiore di Firenze," p. 207, edit. Milan. Compare p. 265.

[8] It was in Rome that Brunelleschi "ritrovó le cornici antiche, e l' ordine Toscano, Corinthio, Dorico, e Ionico alle primarie forme restitui."—Vasari.

Nicolas V., as Pope, as sovereign of Rome, as patron of letters and arts, stood, consciously perhaps, but with a dim perception of the change, at the head of a new æra. It was an epoch in Christian civilisation. To him the Pope might seem as destined for long ages to rule the subject and tributary world; the great monarchies, the Empire, France, Spain, England, were yet to rise, each obedient or hostile to the Pope as might suit their policy. He could not foresee that the Pope, from the high autocrat over all, would become only one of the powers of Christendom. To be a sovereign Italian prince might appear necessary to his dignity, his security. It was but in accordance with the course of things in Italy. Everywhere, except in stern oligarchical Venice, in Milan, in Verona, in Ferrara, in Florence, princes had risen, or were arising, on the ruins of the Republics, Viscontis, Sforzas, Estes, della Scalas, Medicis. Thomas of Sarzana (he took this name, he had no other, from his native town), so obscure that his family was unknown, had no ancestry to glorify, no descendants whom he might be tempted to enrich or to ennoble. He had no prophetic fears that, as sovereign princes, his successors would yield to the inevitable temptation of founding princely families at the expense of the interests, of the estates, and dominions of the Church. Not only was the successor of St. Peter to be merged in the more ambitious politics of the world, but trammeled in the more mean and intricate politics of Italy. Almost from this time the names of the successive Popes may be traced in the annals of the cities and petty principalities of Italy, in the rolls of the estates of the Church, of which they have become lords, in their magnificent palaces in Rome. Among those palaces there is but one, the Colonna, which boasts an ancient name; but few which bear not the name of a papal house. Too often among the Popes of the next century the character (and dark indeed was that character) of the Italian sovereign prince prevailed over that of the Pope. If his house was not perpetuated, it was solely from the indignant hostility and execration of mankind.[h]

[h] Pius II. alienated Radicofani, not to his family, but to his native city, Sienna.

As to Nicolas V. Italy, or rather Latin Christianity, mainly owes her age of learning, as well as its fatal consequences to Rome and to Latin Christianity, so those consequences, in his honest ardour, he would be the last to prognosticate or to foresee. It was the splendid vision of Nicolas V. that Christianity was to array itself in the spoils of the ancient world, and so maintain with more universal veneration her supremacy over the human mind. This, however, the revival of learning, was but one of the four great principles in slow, silent, irresistible operation in Western Christendom, mutually co-operative, blending with and strengthening each other, ominous of and preparing the great revolution of the next century. But to all these, signs at once and harbingers of the coming change, Nicolas could not but be blind; for of these signs some were those which a Pope, himself so pious and so prosperous, might refuse to see; or, if not dazzled by his prosperity, too entirely absorbed in dangers of far other kind, the fall of Constantinople, the advance of the Turks on Western Christendom, might be unable to see. This one danger, as it (so he might hope) would work reformation in the startled Church, would bring the alienated world into close and obedient confederacy with her head. The Pope, like Urban of old, would take his place at the head of the defensive crusade.

Revival of Letters.

I.—Of these principles, of these particular signs, the first was the *progress of the human intellect*, inevitable in the order of things, and resulting in a two-fold oppugnancy to the established dominion of the Church. The first offspring of the expanding intellect was the long-felt, still growing impatience, intolerance of the oppressions, the abuses of the Papacy, of the Papal Court, and of the Papal religion; impatience which did not of necessity involve the rejection of the doctrines of Latin Christianity. The enormous powers still asserted by the Popes over temporal sovereigns, the immunities claimed by the clergy as to their persons and from the common burthens of the State, the exorbitant taxation, the venality of Rome, above all, the Indulgences, with which the Papal power in

its decline seemed determined wantonly to insult the moral and religious sense of mankind. Long before Luther this abuse had rankled in the heart of Christendom. It was in vain for the Church to assert that, rightly understood, Indulgences only released from temporal penances; that they were a commutation, a merciful, lawful commutation for such penances. The language of the promulgators and vendors of the Indulgences, even of the Indulgences themselves, was, to the vulgar ear, the broad, plain, direct guarantee from the pains of purgatory, from hell itself, for tens, hundreds, thousands of years; a sweeping pardon for all sins committed, a sweeping licence for sins to be committed: and if this false construction, it might be, was perilous to the irreligious, this even seeming flagrant dissociation of morality from religion was no less revolting to the religious.[i] Nor was there as yet any general improvement in the lives of the Clergy or of the Monks, which by its awful sanctity might rebuke the vulgar and natural interpretation of these Indulgences.[k] The antagonism of the more enlightened intellect to the *doctrines* of the mediæval Church was slower, more timid, more reluctant. It was as yet but doubt, suspicion, indifference; the irreligious were content to be quietly irreligious; the religious had not as yet found in the plain Biblical doctrines that on which they could calmly and contentedly rest their faith. Religion had not risen to a purer spirituality to compensate for the loss of the materialistic worship of the dominant Church. The conscience shrunk from the responsibility of taking cognizance of itself; the soul dared not work out its own salvation. The clergy slept on the brink of the precipice. So long as they were not openly opposed they thought all was safe. So long as unbelief in the whole of their system lurked quietly in men's hearts, they cared not to inquire what was brooding in those inner depths.

[i] Chaucer's Pardoner is a striking illustration of the popular notion and popular feeling in England.

[k] The irrefragable testimony to the universal misinterpretation, the natural, inevitable misinterpretation of the language of the Indulgences, the misinterpretation riveted on the minds of men by their profligate vendors, is the solemn, reiterated repudiation of those notions by Councils and by Popes. The definitions of the Council of Trent and of Pius V. had not been wanted, if the Church doctrine had been the belief of mankind.

II.—The second omen at once and sign of change was the cultivation of classical learning. Letters almost at once ceased to be cloistral, hierarchical, before long almost to be Christian. In Italy, indeed, the Pope had set himself at the head of this vast movement; yet Florence vied with Rome. Cosmo de' Medici was the rival of Nicolas V. But, notwithstanding the Pope's position, the clergy rapidly ceased to be the sole and almost exclusive depositaries of letters. The scholars might condescend to hold canonries or abbeys as means of maintenance, as honours, or rewards (thus, long before, had Petrarch been endowed), but it was with the tacit understanding, or at least the almost unlimited enjoyment, of perfect freedom from ecclesiastical control, so long as they did not avowedly enter on theological grounds, which they avoided rather from indifference and from growing contempt, than from respect. On every side were expanding new avenues of inquiry, new trains of thought: new models of composition were offering themselves; all tended silently to impair the reverence for the ruling authorities. Men could not labour to write like Cicero and Cæsar without imbibing something of their spirit. The old ecclesiastical Latin began to be repudiated as rude and barbarous. Scholasticism had crushed itself with its own weight. When monks or friars were the only men of letters, and monastic schools the only field in which intellect encountered intellect, the huge tomes of Aquinas, and the more summary axioms of Peter Lombard, might absorb almost the whole active mind of Christendom. But Plato now drove out the Theologic Platonism, Aristotle the Aristotelism of the schools. The Platonism, indeed, of Marsilius Ficinus, taking its interpretation rather from Proclus and Plotinus and the Alexandrians, would hardly have offended Julian himself by any obtrusive display of Christianity. On his death-bed Cosmo de' Medici is attended by Ficinus, who assures him of another life on the authority of Socrates, and teaches him resignation in the words of Plato, Xenocrates, and other Athenian sages. The cultivation of Greek was still more fatal to Latin domination. Even the familiar study of the Greek Fathers (as far

Revival of Letters.

as an imposing ritual and the monastic spirit consistent with those of the Latin Church) was altogether alien to the scholasticism dominant in Latin Theology. They knew nothing of the Latin supremacy, nothing of the rigid form, which many of its doctrines, as of Transubstantiation, had assumed. Greek revealed a whole religious world, extraneous to and in many respects oppugnant to Latin Christianity. But the most fatal result was the revelation of the Greek Testament, necessarily followed by that of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the dawn of a wider Biblical Criticism. The proposal of a new translation of the Scriptures at once disenthroned the Vulgate from its absolute exclusive authority. It could not but admit the Greek, and then the Hebrew, as its rival, as its superior in antiquity. Biblical Criticism once begun, the old voluminous authoritative interpreters, De Lyra, Turrecremata, Cornelius a Lapide, were thrown into obscurity. Erasmus was sure to come; with Erasmus a more simple, clear, popular interpretation of the divine word.[m] The mystic and allegoric comment on the Scriptures, on which rested wholly some of the boldest assertions of Latin Christianity, fell away at once before his closer, more literal, more grammatical study of the Text. At all events, the Vulgate receded, and with the Vulgate Latin Christianity began to withdraw into a separate sphere; it ceased to be the sole, universal religion of Western Christendom.

Modern Languages.

III.—The growth of the modern languages not merely into vernacular means of communication, but into the vehicles of letters, of poetry, of oratory, of history, of preaching, at length of national documents, still later of law and of science, threw back Latin more and more into a learned dialect. It was relegated into the study of the scholar, into books intended for the intercommunication only of the learned, and for a certain time for the negotiations and treaties of remote kingdoms, who were forced to meet on some common ground. It is curious that in Italy the revival of classical learning for a time crushed the native

[m] The Paraphrase and Notes of Erasmus, in my judgement, was the most important Book even of his day. We must remember that it was almost legally adopted by the Church of England.

literature, or at least retarded its progress. From Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, to Ariosto and Machiavelli, excepting some historians, Malespina, Dino Compagni, Villani, there is almost total silence: silence, at least, unbroken by any powerful voice. Nor did the liberal patronage of Nicolas V. call forth one work of lasting celebrity in the native tongue. The connection of the development of the Transalpine, more especially the Teutonic languages, has been already examined more at length. Here it may suffice to resume, that the vernacular translation of the Bible was an inevitable result of the perfection of those tongues. In Germany and in England that translation tended most materially, by fixing a standard in general of vigorous, noble, poetic, yet idiomatic language, to hasten, to perpetuate the change. It was natural that as soon as a nation had any books of its own, it should seek to have the Book of Books. The Church, indeed, trembling for the supremacy of her own Vulgate, and having witnessed the fatal perils of such Translations in the successes of all the earlier Dissidents, was perplexed and wavered in her policy. Now she thundered out her awful prohibition; now endeavoured herself to supply the want which would not remain unsatisfied, by a safer and a sanctioned version. But the mind of man could not wait on her hesitating movements. The free, bold, untrammelled version had possession of the national mind and national language; it had become the undeniable patrimony of the people, the standard of the language.

IV.—Just at this period the two great final Reformers, the inventor of printing and the manufacturer of paper, had not only commenced, but perfected at once their harmonious inventions. Books, from slow, toilsome, costly productions, became cheap, were multiplied with rapidity which seemed like magic, and were accessible to thousands to whom manuscripts were utterly unapproachable. The power, the desire, increased with the facility of reading. Theology, from an abstruse recondite science, the exclusive possession of an Order, became popular; it was, ere long, the general study, the general passion. The Preacher was not sought the less on account of this vast

Printing and Paper.

extension of his influence. His eloquent words were no longer limited by the walls of a Church, or the power of a human voice; they were echoed, perpetuated, promulgated over a kingdom, over a continent. The fiery Preacher became a pamphleteer; he addressed a whole realm; he addressed mankind. It was no longer necessary that man should act directly upon man; that the flock should derive their whole knowledge from their Pastor, the individual Christian from his ghostly adviser. The man might find satisfaction for his doubts, guidance for his thoughts, excitement for his piety in his own chamber from the silent pages of the theological treatise. To many the Book became the Preacher, the Instructor, even the Confessor. The conscience began to claim the privilege, the right, of granting absolution to itself. All this, of course, at first timidly, intermittingly, with many compunctious returns to the deserted fold. The Hierarchy endeavoured to seize and bind down to their own service these unruly powers. Their presses at Venice, at Florence, at Rome, displayed the new art in its highest magnificence; but it was not the splendid volume, the bold and majestic type, the industrious editorial care, which worked downwards into the depths of society; it was the coarse, rude, brown sheet; the ill-cut German type; the brief, sententious, plain tract, which escaped all vigilance, which sunk untraced, unanswered, unconfuted, into the eager minds of awakening man. The sternest vigilance might be exercised by the Argus-eyes of the still ubiquitous Clergy. The most solemn condemnations, the most awful prohibitions might be issued; yet from the birthday of printing, their sole exclusive authority over the mind of man was gone. That they rallied and resumed so much power; that they had the wisdom and the skill to seize upon the education of mankind, and to seal up again the outbursting springs of knowledge, and free examination, is a mighty marvel. Though from the rivals, the opponents, the foes, the subjugators of the great Temporal Despots, they became, by their yet powerful hold on the conscience, and by their common interests in keeping mankind in slavery, their allies, their ministers, their rulers; yet, from that hour, the Popes must encounter more

dangerous, pertinacious, unconquerable antagonists than the Hohenstaufens and Bavarians, the Henrys and Fredericks of old. The sacerdotal caste must recede from authority to influence. Here they would mingle into the general mass of society, assimilate themselves to the bulk of mankind, become citizens, subjects, fathers of families, and fulfilling the common duties and relations of life, work more profoundly beneficial, moral, and religious effects. There they would still stand in a great degree apart, as a separate, unmingling order, yet submit to public opinion, if exercising controul, themselves under strong controul. This great part of the sacerdotal order at a much later period was to be stripped with ruder and more remorseless hands of their power, their rank, their wealth; they were to be thrust down from their high places, to become stipendiaries of the state. Their great strength, Monasticism, in some kingdoms was to be abolished by law, which they could not resist; or it was only tolerated as useful to the education, and to the charitable necessities of mankind; almost everywhere it sunk into desuetude, or lingered as the last earthly resort of the world-weary and despondent, the refuge of a rare fanaticism, which now excites wonder rather than wide-spread emulation. From Nicolas V., seated, as it were, on its last summit, the Papal power, the Hierarchical system, commences its visible decline. Latin Christianity had to cede a large portion of its realms, which became the more flourishing, prosperous, intellectual portion of the world, to Teutonic Christianity. It had hereafter to undergo more fierce and fiery trials. But whatever may be its future doom, one thing may be asserted without fear, it can never again be the universal Christianity of the West.

I pretend not to foretell the future of Christianity; but whosoever believes in its perpetuity (and to disbelieve it were treason against its Divine Author, apostacy from his faith) must suppose that, by some providential law, it must adapt itself, as it has adapted itself with such wonderful versatility, but with a faithful conservation of its inner vital spirit, to all vicissitudes and phases of man's social, moral, intellectual being. There is no need to discuss a recent

theory (of M. Comte) that man is to become all intellect; and that religion, residing rather in the imagination, the affections, and the conscience, is to wither away, and cede the whole dominion over mankind to what is called "positive philosophy." I have no more faith in the mathematical millennium of M. Comte (at all events we have centuries enough to wait for it) than in the religious millennium of some Judaising Christians.

Latin Christianity or Papal Christianity (which is Latin Christianity in its full development), whatever it may be called with least offence, has not only ceased to be, it can never again be, the exclusive, the paramount, assuredly not the universal religion of enlightened men. The more advanced the civilisation, no doubt, in a certain sense, the more need of Christianity. All restrictive views, therefore, of Christianity, especially if such Christianity be at issue with the moral sense, and with the progressive reason of man, are urged with perilous and fearful responsibility. Better Christianity vague in creed, defective in polity, than no Christianity. If Latin Christianity were to be the one perpetual, immutable, unalterable code, how much of the world would still be openly, how much secretly without religion? Even in what we may call the Latin world, to how large a part is Latin Christianity what the religion of old Rome was in the days of Cæsar and Cicero, an object of traditionary and prudential respect, of vast political importance, an edifice of which men fear to see the ruin, yet have no inward sense of its foundation in truth? On more religious minds it will doubtless maintain its hold as a religion of authority—a religion of outward form—an objective religion, and so possessing inexhaustible powers of awakening religious emotion. As a religion of authority, as an objective religion, as an emotional religion, it may draw within its pale proselytes of congenial minds from a more vague, more subjective, more rational faith. As a religion of authority it spares the soul from the pain of thought, from the harassing doubt, the despondent scruple. Its positive and peremptory assurances not only overawe the weak, but offer an indescribable consolation—a rest, a repose, which seems at least to be peace.

Independence of thought, which to some is their holiest birthright, their most glorious privilege, their sternest duty, is to others the profoundest misery, the heaviest burthen, the responsibility from which they would shrink with the deepest awe, which they would plunge into any abyss to avoid. What relief to devolve upon another the oppressive question of our eternal destiny!

As an objective religion, a materialistic religion, a religion which addresses itself to the senses of man, Latin Christianity has no less great and enduring power. To how many is there no reality without bodily form, without at least the outline, the symbol suggestive of bodily form! With the vulgar, at least it does not rebuke the rudest, coarsest superstition; for the more educated, the symbol refines itself almost to spirituality.

With a large part of mankind, a far larger no doubt of womankind, whose sensibilities are in general more quick and intense than the reasoning faculties, Christian emotion will still either be the whole of religion, or the measure, and the test of religion. Doubtless some primary elements of religion seem intuitive, and are anterior to, or rise without the consciousness of any reasoning process, whose office it is to confirm and strengthen them—the existence of God and of the Infinite, Divine Providence, the religious sense of right and wrong, retribution; more or less vaguely the immortality of the soul. Other doctrines will ever be assumed to be as eternal and immutable. With regard to these, the religious sentiment, which lives upon religious emotion, will be as reluctant to appeal to the slow, cold verdict of the judgment. Their evidence is their power of awakening, keeping alive, and rendering more intense the feeling, the passion of reverence, of adoration, of awe and love. To question them is impiety; to examine them perilous imprudence; to reject them misery, the most dreary privation. Emotional religion—and how large a part of the religion of mankind is emotional!—refuses any appeal from itself.

Latin Christianity, too, will continue to have a firmer hold on the nations of Latin descent; of those whose languages have a dominant affinity with the Latin. It is not even clear whether it may not have some secret charm for

those instructed in Latin; at all events, with them the religious language of Latin Christianity being more intelligible, hardly more than an antiquated and sacred dialect of their own, will not so peremptorily demand its transference into the popular and vernacular tongue.

But that which is the strength of Latin Christianity in some regions, in some periods, with some races, with some individual minds, is in other lands, times, nations, and minds its fatal, irremediable principle of decay and dissolution; and must become more so with the advancement of mankind in knowledge, especially in historical knowledge. That authority which is here a sacred, revered despotism, is there an usurpation, an intolerable tyranny. The Teutonic mind never entirely threw off its innate independence. The long feuds of the Empire and the Papacy were but a rude and premature attempt at emancipation from a yoke to which Rome had submitted her conqueror. Had the Emperors not striven for the mastery of the Latin world, had they stood aloof from Italy, even then the issue might have been different. A Teutonic Emperor had been a more formidable antagonist. But it is not the authority of the Pope alone, but that of the sacerdotal order, against which there is a deep, irresistible insurrection in the Teutonic mind. Men have begun to doubt, men are under the incapacity of believing, men have ceased to believe, the absolutely indispensable necessity of the intervention of any one of their fellow-creatures between themselves and the mercy of God. They cannot admit that the secret of their eternal destination is undeniably confided to another; that they must walk not by the light of their own conscience, but by foreign guidance; that the Clergy are more than messengers with a mission to keep up, with constant reiteration, the truths of the Gospel, to be prepared by special study for the interpretation of the sacred writings, to minister in the simpler ordinances of religion; that they have absolute power to release from sins: without omniscience to act in the place of the Omniscient. This, which, however disguised or softened off, is the doctrine of Latin, of mediæval, of Papal Christianity, has become offensive, presumptuous; to the less serious, ludicrous. Of course,

as the relative position of the Clergy, once the sole masters of almost all intellectual knowledge, law, history, philosophy, has totally changed, their lofty pretensions jar more strongly against the common sense of man. Even the interpretation of the sacred writings is no secret and esoteric doctrine, no mystery of which they are the sole and exclusive hierophants.

Toleration, in truth—toleration, which is utterly irreconcilable with the theory of Latin Christianity, has been forced into the mind and heart of Christendom, even among many whose so-called immutable creed is in its irrevocable words as intolerant as ever. What was proclaimed boldly, nakedly, without reserve, without limitation, and as implicitly believed by little less than all mankind, is now, in a large part of the civilised world, hardly asserted except in the heat of controversy, or from a gallant resolution not to shrink from logical consequences. Wherever publicly avowed or maintained, it is thought but an odious adherence to ignorant bigotry. It is believed by a still-diminishing few that Priest, Cardinal, Pope has the power of irrevocably pre-declaring the doom of his fellow-men. Though the Latin Church-language may maintain its unmitigated severity, it is eluded by some admitted reservation, some implied condition utterly at variance with the peremptory tone of the old anathema. Excommunication is obsolete; the interdict on a nation has not been heard for centuries; even the proscription of books is an idle protest.

The subjective, more purely internal, less demonstrative character of Teutonic religion is equally impatient of the more distinct and definite, and rigid objectiveness of Latin Christianity. That which seems to lead the Southern up to heaven, the regular intermediate ascending hosts of Saints, Martyrs, Apostles, the Virgin, to the contemplative Teuton, obscures and intercepts his aweful, intuitive sense of the Godhead, unspiritualises his Deity, whom he can no longer worship as pure Spirit. To him it is the very vagueness, vastness, incomprehensibility of his conception of the Godhead which proclaims its reality. If here God must be seen on the altar in a materialised form, at once visible and invisible; if God must be working a

perpetual miracle; if the passive spirit must await the descent of the Godhead in some sensible sign or symbol; —there, on the other hand (especially as the laws of nature become better known and more familiar, and what of old seemed arbitrary variable agencies are become manifest laws), the Deity as it were recedes into more unapproachable majesty. It may indeed subtilise itself into a metaphysical First Cause, may expand into a dim Pantheism, but with the religious his religion still rests in a wise and sublime and revered system of Providential government which implies the Divine Personality.

Latin, the more objective faith, tends to materialism, to servility, to blind obedience or blind guidance, to the tacit abrogation, if not the repudiation, of the moral influence by the undue elevation of the dogmatic and ritual part. It is prone to become, as it has become, Paganism with Christian images, symbols, and terms; it has, in its consummate state, altogether set itself above and apart from Christian, from universal morality, and made what are called works of faith the whole of religion: the religion of the murderer, who, if while he sheathes his dagger in the heart of his victim, he does homage to an image of the Virgin, is still religious;[n] the religion of the tyrant, who, if he retires in Lent to sackcloth and ashes, may live the rest of the year in promiscuous concubinage, and slaughter his subjects by thousands. So Teutonic Christianity, more self-depending, more self-guided, more self wrought out, is not without its peculiar dangers. It may become self-sufficient, unwarrantably arrogant, impatient not merely of control, but of all subordination, incapable of just self-estimation. It will have a tendency to isolate the man, either within himself or as a member of a narrow sect, with all the evils of sectarianism, blind zeal, obstinate self-reliance, or rather self-adoration, hatred, contempt of others, moroseness, exclusiveness, fanaticism, undue appreciation of small things. It will have its own antinomianism, a dissociation of that moral and religious perfection of man which is Christianity; it will appeal to conscious direct influences of Divine Grace

[n] Read what Mr. Coleridge used to call the sublime of Roman Catholic Antinomianism. Calderon, Devocion de la Cruz.

with as much confidence, and as little discrimination or judgement, as the Latin to that through the intermediate hierarchy and ritual of the Church.

Its intellectual faith will be more robust; nor will its emotional be less profound and intense. But the strength of its intellectual faith (and herein is at once its glory and its danger) will know no limits to its daring speculation. How far Teutonic Christianity may in some parts already have gone almost or absolutely beyond the pale of Christianity, how far it may have lost itself in its unrebuked wanderings, posterity only will know. What distinctness of conception, what precision of language, may be indispensable to true faith; what part of the ancient dogmatic system may be allowed silently to fall into disuse, as at least superfluous, and as beyond the proper range of human thought and human language; how far the Sacred records may, without real peril to their truth, be subjected to closer investigation; to what wider interpretation, especially of the Semitic portion, those records may submit, and wisely submit, in order to harmonise them with the irrefutable conclusions of science; how far the Eastern veil of allegory which hangs over their truth may be lifted or torn away to show their unshadowed essence; how far the poetic vehicle through which truth is conveyed may be gently severed from the truth;—all this must be left to the future historian of our religion. As it is my own confident belief that the words of Christ, and his words alone (the primal, indefeasible truths of Christianity), shall not pass away; so I cannot presume to say that men may not attain to a clearer, at the same time more full and comprehensive and balanced sense of those words, than has as yet been generally received in the Christian world. As all else is transient and mutable, these only eternal and universal, assuredly, whatever light may be thrown on the mental constitution of man, even on the constitution of nature, and the laws which govern the world, will be concentered so as to give a more penetrating vision of those undying truths. Teutonic Christianity (and this seems to be its mission and privilege), however nearly in its more perfect form it may already have approximated, may approximate still more closely to

the absolute and perfect faith of Christ; it may discover and establish the sublime unison of religion and reason; keep in tone the triple-chorded harmony of faith, holiness, and charity; assert its own full freedom, know the bounds of that freedom, respect the freedom of others. Christianity may yet have to exercise a far wider, even if more silent and untraceable influence, through its primary, all-penetrating, all-pervading principles, on the civilisation of mankind.

INDEX.

A.

Abbeys plundered by great prelates, iii. 79. Property of, vi. 372.

Abdication, Papal. *See* Cœlestine V.

Abelard, iii. 347. His birth and youth, 359. At Paris, 360. His theology, 361. Flight with Heloisa, 363. Marriage and mutilation, 364. Resumes lectures—his treatise on the Trinity condemned by Council of Soissons, 365. His contest with monks of St. Denys, 366. Founds "The Paraclete," 367. Abbot of S. Gildas in Brittany, 368. His letters, 369. Challenge to S. Bernard, 370. Appeals to Rome, 372. Is condemned at Rome, 375. Protected at Clugny, 376. His death and burial at the Paraclete, 377. Opinions, 377. 'Sic et Non,' 379.

Absolute poverty, question of, v. 438. Asserted by Franciscan Chapter of Perugia, 439.

Absolution, form of among Templars, v. 343.

Abubeker, successor of Mohammed, ii. 35.

Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople, overthrows Basiliscus, i. 232. His power and ambition, 234. Disputes Roman supremacy, 234. His strife with Pope Felix, 238.

Acerra, Thomas of, iv. 336.

Adalberon, Bishop of Laon, ii. 490.

Adalbert, son of Berengar, ii. 465. Takes refuge with Saracens, 467. His league with Pope John XII., 468.

Adalbert II. (the Rich), Marquis of Tuscany, ii. 449. Marries Bertha—defeated by Lambert, 449. His power, 450.

Adalbert of Bremen, iii. 77. His influence over Henry IV., 78. Combination against, 81. Fall of, 82.

Adelaide, Empress, accuses Henry IV., iii. 216.

Adelaide, widow of Lothair, persecuted by Berengar—marries Otho the Great, ii. 465.

Adelchis, son of Desiderius, ii. 260. Obtains aid from Constantinople, 265.

Adelgis, Duke of Benevento, ii. 396.

Adeodatus, Pope, ii. 136.

Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, Papal Legate in Crusade, iii. 243.

Adolph of Nassau, v. 167. King of Romans, 168. Conditions of his election, 169. His alliance with England, 170. Slain in battle, 171.

Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne, deposed, iv. 49. Restored, 59.

Adoptians, sect of, ii. 299.

Adrianople, battle of, iv. 160.

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II.), vi. 263. His secret influence, 305. Parentage, 306, and youth, 307. His journey to England and Scotland, 308. Immorality, 311. At Basle, 313. His history, 314. Hostility to Eugenius IV., 315. Recovers from the plague, 316. Secretary to Felix V., 317. Secretary to Emperor, 318. His time-serving, 319. In holy orders, 320. Letters of, 321. Comes round to Eugenius—his mission to Italy, 323. Apology to Pope, 324. Made Papal Secretary, 325. At Frankfort—his journey to Rome, 326. Again at Frankfort, 328. His danger and conduct, 329. Gains over Diet to the Pope, 330. Made Bishop of Trieste, 331. At Milan, 336. At Tabor in Bohemia, 340. Bishop of Sienna, 341. Legate in Germany, 343. His dread of Turks, 347. Popedom and character, 348. Letter to Mahomet II., 349. Zeal against Turks, 349.

Africa, the parent of Latin Christianity, i. 29. Importance of to Latin Empire, 184. Suffers from Donatist schism, 185. Cruelties of the Vandals in, 332. Conquest by Belisarius, 332. Retains Donatist heresy, 447. Mohammedan conquest of, ii. 45.

African Church, its relations with Roman See, i. 186. Its difficulties, 187. Asserts independence of Rome, 189. Sufferings of under Vandals, 190. Its reduced state (11th century), iii. 122.

Agapetus, Pope, ambassador to Constantinople, i. 335. His reception, 335. Dispute with Justinian, 336. Triumph and death, 336.

Agatho, Pope, ii. 136.

Agilulf, King of Lombards, i. 456. Attacks Rome, 456.

Agnes, Empress, guardian of Henry IV., iii. 43. Weak position of, 73. Her monastic feelings, 154.

Agnes of Meran marries Philip Augustus, iv. 65. Her separation, 72. Dies, 74.

Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, ii. 67.

Ailly, Peter d', Cardinal of Cambray, his mission to rival popes—at Rome, vi. 45. At Avignon, 46. His sermon at Constance, 172. Extends right of suffrage, 180.

Aiscelin, Gilles d', Archbishop of Narbonne, v. 316.

Aix-la-Chapelle, ii. 279.

Aix-la-Chapelle, Diet of, ii. 315. Legislates for the Church, 316. Its independence of Rome, 317. Settles the succession to the empire, 318.

Alaimo de Leontini defends Messina, v. 115, 117.

Alaric defeated by Stilicho, i. 94. His second invasion of Italy, 97. Besieges Rome, 98. Accepts ransom, 99. Sets up Attalus

as Emperor, 100. His final capture of Rome, 101. Spares Christian churches and sacred vessels, 104.

Alberic, son of Marozia, ii. 459. Rises against Hugh of Provence—lord of Rome, 460. His rule and death, 464.

Alberic da Romano tortured to death, v. 34.

Albert of Austria, letter of Gregory IX. to, iv. 348.

Albert of Austria, Emperor, v. 168. Defeats Adolph of Nassau, 171. Excommunicated, 172. Alliance of with Philip the Fair, 223. Reconciliation with Pope, 224. His oath, 244. Murdered, 308.

Albert of Austria, King of the Romans, vi. 315.

Albert von Beham, iv. 403, 442.

Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, iii. 317.

Albert the Great, vi. 446, 449. His birth and teaching, 452. His learning—lectures on Aristotle, 453. Theology of, 454. Philosophy, 457.

Albi, heresies in, iv. 179.

Albigensian war, iv. 208. Innocent. III.'s conduct in, 280.

Albigensians. *See* Waldenses.

Albinus, i 318.

Alboin, i. 453. His death, 454.

Albornoz, Cardinal, legate in Italy, v. 550. Appoints Rienzi senator, 552. Restores Papal power, 553. Receives Urban V. in Italy—his death, 560.

Alcuin, ii. 305.

Aldfrid, King of Northumbria, his disputes with Wilfrid, ii. 87. His remorse and death, 89.

Aldhelm of Malmsbury, ii. 96.

Alexander II. (Anselm of Badagio), iii. 60. Resists marriage of clergy, 63. Elected Pope by Cardinals, 67. Defeated by Cadalous, 72. His election confirmed at Osbor, 75; and at Mantua, 83. Dies, 92. Sanctions Norman invasion of England, 120.

Alexander III., Pope, disputed election of, iii. 428. Excommunicates Frederick Barbarossa, 431. His voyage to France, 432. His relations with Becket, 434. Holds council at Tours, 457. Absolves Becket, 466. His embarrassment and hesitation, 467, 492, 509. Gains possession of Rome, 486. Suspends Becket's sentences, 497. Absolves Bishops of London and Salisbury, 509. His connexion with Becket's career, 529. Reception of at Rome, 530. Makes peace with Emperor at Venice, 535. His death, 538.

Alexander IV., Pope, v. 24. Excites English against Manfred, 26. His contest with Brancaleone, 29. His antipathy to Manfred, 32. Favours friars, 45. His Bull to University of Paris, 46. His death, 53.

Alexander V., his obscure origin, vi. 74. Favours Franciscans, 75. His Bull in favour of friars, 76. Murmurs against, 78. His death, 80.

Alexander the Mason, councillor of King John, iv. 90.

Alexandria, quarrels at, i. 227.

Alexandria (in Piedmont), its foundation, iii. 534.

Alexius Comnenus, his jealousy of Crusaders, iii. 240.

Alexius Comnenus the Elder, deposes and blinds his brother Isaac, iv. 137. His flight, 145.

Alexius Comnenus the Younger, escapes from prison—flies to Rome, iv. 137. Appeals to Crusaders at Venice, 138. His treaty with Crusaders at Zara, 142.

Alfonso of Castile, v. 75.

Alfonso, King of Leon, iv. 114.

Alfonso, King of Arragon, v. 123. His treaty with Charles the Lame, 125. His death, 127.

Alfonso of Arragon, vi. 304.

Alfred anointed by the Pope, ii. 440. His wars, 441. Compels Guthrun to be baptised, 442. Learns to read, 442. His love of Saxon books—continues poems of Cædmon—his translations from Latin, 443.

Ali, Mohammed's second convert, ii. 17. His honour and loyalty, ii. 35.

Allegorical paintings, v. 519.

Allegory, vi. 541.

Alliterative verse, vi. 536.

Alsace, desolation of, ii. 102.

Altman, Bishop of Passau, iii. 141. Papal legate at Tribur, 161.

Amadeus of Savoy. *See* Felix V.

Amalasuntha, widow of Theodoric, marries Theodotus, i. 333. Put to death, 333.

Amatory poetry, monkish, vi. 500.

Amaury de Bene, vi. 444.

Ambrose, St., of Milan, i. 78, 79. His authority quoted for marriage of clergy, iii. 61.

Ammianus, i. 68.

Amour, *St.*, William, resists Friars, v. 45. His 'Perils of the Last Times,' 49. His exile and popularity, 50.

Anacletus II., Antipope, iii. 326. Holds St. Angelo, 341. His death, 342.

Anacreontics, religious, vi. 498.

Anagni threatened by Romans, v. 30. Boniface VIII. at, 257. Betrays Pope, 260. Rescues him, 263. Cardinals at, vi. 12.

Anastasius, Emperor, i. 239. Enforces toleration, 240. Deposes Bishop Euphemius, 241. His alleged Manicheism, 243. Dispute with Macedonius, 244. Critical position of, 246. His humiliation, 247. Appeals to Pope Hormisdas, 308. Rejects conditions, 311, 312. His death, 312.

Anastasius I., Pope, i. 79.

Anastasius II., Pope, his leniency, i. 252. His death—his memory detested, 253.

Anastasius IV., Pope, iii. 408.

Anastasius, Bishop of Constantinople, his intrigues for Artavasdus, ii. 167. His punishment, 169.

Ancona, siege of, iii. 531.

Andrew's, *St*, head, vi. 425.

Andrew, King of Hungary, his conversion, iii. 30. His war with Henry III., 30.

Andrew, King of Hungary, iv. 121. Grants Golden Bull, 121. His crusade, 286.

Andrew of Hungary murdered, v. 508.

Andronicus, Greek Emperor, restores independence of Greek Church, v. 97.

Angelo, *St.*, siege of, vi. 55.

Angels, belief regarding, vi. 401, 469. Orders of, 403.

Anglo-Norman hierarchy, iii. 440.

ANGLO-NORMAN.

Anglo-Saxon Christianity, vi. 530.
Anglo-Saxon Christian poetry, ii. 94.
Anglo-Saxon Church, divisions in, ii. 70. Monasticism of, 78.
Anglo-Saxon clergy, decay of, iii. 435. Resist Roman clergy, 437.
Anglo-Saxon language, vi. 529.
Anglo-Saxon missionaries, vi. 530.
Anglo-Saxons, their heathenism, ii. 55. Expel Christianity from Britain, 56. Civilised by Christianity, 72. Their reverence for Rome, 73. Church music among, 97. Their laws, 98. Their bishoprics, 99. Christianity of, iii. 435.
Annales, vi. 225, 226.
Annates, vi. 35.
Anne of Bohemia, vi. 138.
Anschar, his visions, ii. 435. His mission to Denmark, 436; to Sweden, 437. Archbishop of Hamburg, 437.
Anselm of Badagio. *See* Alexander II.
Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, iii. 194.
Anselm, S., at Bec, iii. 356. His philosophy, 357. Was premature, vi. 437.
Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, resists the crown, iii. 439.
Anspert, Archbishop of Milan, iii. 55.
Anthemius, Emperor of the West, i. 225.
Anthemius, Bishop of Constantinople—opposed by Agapetus and degraded, i. 336.
Anthropomorphism of popular Christianity, vi. 400, 455.
Antioch, disturbances in, i. 228, 242.
Antisacerdotalism, iv. 170. Spreads among burghers, 173. In South of France, 179.
Antisacerdotalists, Biblical, iv. 181.
Antonina degrades Pope Silverius, i. 338.
Antonius, Bishop of Fussola, i. 186. His appeal to the Pope, 187.
Antony of Padua, a Franciscan, iv. 273. His preaching, 274.
Apiarius, presbyter at Sicca, i. 187. Deposed; appeals to Pope Zosimus—confesses his guilt, 188.
Apostles of Parma, v. 425, 427.
Appeal to Rome, arose out of provincial jealousies, i. 191. Subjected to royal consent, iii. 465.
Apulia, war in, iv. 350. Conspiracy in against Frederick II., 438.
Aquinas, Thomas, death of, v. 91. One of five great Schoolmen, vi. 449. His early life, 458. His authority, death, and canonization, 459. His 'Sum of Theology,' 460. His opinions, 461. His philosophy, 461, 463.
Arabia, independence and supposed wealth of, ii. 6. United under Mohammed, 22.
Arabian Jews, ii. 20.
Arabic philosophy, vi. 441, 448. Schools, 442.
Arabic, translations from, vi. 446.
Arabs, their immutable character, ii. 7. Their love of war and rapine, 29.
Arbon, monastery of, ii. 108.
Arch, principle of, vi. 566.
Architects, ecclesiastic, vi. 580. Foreign, 588.
Architecture, Christian, vi. 333. Faithful to the church, 563. Christian, first epoch of,

ASIATIC.

565. Roman, 565. Greek and Latin, 566. Byzantine, 570. Church, influenced by ritual, 573. Christian, progressive, 574. Lombard or Romanesque, 580. Norman, 583. Gothic, 584. Affected by climate, 591. Mediæval, 619.
Ardoin, Marquis of Ivrea, ii. 500.
Arialdi, iii. 64. His strife with Guido, 86. His flight and death, 87.
Arian clergy (Goths), their moderation, i. 301. Were probably Teutonic, 402.
Arianism of Teutonic converts, i. 269. Its propagators unknown, 270. Of Goths, 300. Put an end to in Spain, 445. In Gaul, 446.
Aristotelian Philosophy, vi. 443.
Aristotle, Arabic adoption of, vi. 441. Dialectics of, 443. Condemned at Paris, 445. Versions of from Arabic, 446. Becomes known in original, 447.
Arles, Council of, i. 62. Archbishopric of, 192.
Arles, Cardinal of, vi. 297. At Diet of Frankfort, 328.
Arnaud, William, Inquisitor at Toulouse, murdered, v. 19.
Arnold of Brescia, iii. 347, 383. A disciple of Abélard, 384. His republicanism, 385. Preaches in Brescia, 387. Condemned by Lateran Council, flies to Zurich, 388. Protected by Guido di Castello, 389. Persecuted by S. Bernard, 390. Revered by Waldenses, 390. In Rome, 391. Decline of his influence, 407. Banished, 410. Seized and executed, 413. Revival of his opinions, iv. 171.
Arnold, Abbot, Papal Legate in Languedoc, iv. 213. Persecutes Count Raymond, 217. Made Archbishop of Narbonne, 223. Charges against, 224. At Lateran Council, 229.
Arnulf invades Italy. Sacks Bergamo, ii. 412. His second invasion—enters Rome—crowned Emperor, 413. His sudden illness and retreat, 414.
Arnulf, Archbishop of Rheims, ii. 488. His treachery to Hugh Capet, 489. Is betrayed and imprisoned, 490. His deposition, 491.
Arnulf, Bishop of Orleans, his speech against corruption of papacy, ii. 491.
Arragon, affairs of, iv. 117. Made feudatory to Pope, 119. The nobles and people remonstrate, 119.
Arragon, House of, representatives of Manfred, v. 106. Franciscan prophecies about, 429.
Arsenius, Papal Legate in France, ii. 368. Reinstates Queen Theutberga, 370. His flight and death, 381.
Art, devotional, ii. 149. Objects of, 187, 188. Conventional, vi. 610. Development of, 611. Cultivated by Mendicant orders, 614. German—Flemish, 618.
Artavasdus usurps throne of Constantinople, ii. 167. Is defeated and blinded, 169.
Arthur, King, legends of, vi. 524.
Arthur, Prince, death of, iv. 79.
Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, vi. 141. Accuses Lord Cobham, 148.
Ashpalter, Peter, Archbishop of Mentz, v. 384, 448.
Asiatic Christianity, feebleness of, ii. 5.

Assisi, birthplace of St. Francis, iv. 261. Splendour of church at, vi. 614.
Astolph, Lombard king, seizes Ravenna and threatens Rome, ii. 238. Defeated by Franks, obtains peace - besieges Rome, 242. Yields to Pepin, 245. His death, 246.
Asylum, in Barbaric law, i. 390, 396.
Athaluric, son of Theodoric, raised to throne of Italy—his death, i. 333. Laws of on church matters, 378.
Athanasian creed, i. 61.
Athanasius, i. 59. His ascendancy at Rome, 61. Supported by Pope Liberius, 63.
Athanasius, Bishop-Duke of Naples, ii. 398. Unites with the Saracens, 399. Excommunicated by John VIII., his intrigues, 405.
Attalus made Emperor by Alaric, i. 100. Deposed by him, 101.
Attila, his unbounded power, i. 214. His invasion of Italy, 215. Threatens Rome, 215. Induced to retire by Leo I., 215. Probable causes of this, 216.
Averrhoes, vi. 443, 448.
Augustine, St., his 'City of God,' i. 107. Opposes Pelagius, 111. The leader of Latin Theology, 114. Opinions on infant baptism, 115. Persecutes Pelagians, 127, 128.
Augustine, his mission to Britain, i. 448; ii. 57. His meeting with Ethelbert, 57. Bishop of Canterbury, 58. His dispute with British clergy, 60, 61. His establishment at Canterbury, 61.
Augustinianism coincides with sacerdotal system, i. 116. On transmission of original sin, 117. Similar to Manicheism, 118. Exalts celibacy, 119.
Augustus, title of Rienzi, v. 523.
Avicenna, vi. 443, 448.
Avignon, Pope Clement V. at, v. 363. Consistory at, 368. Its political situation, 407. Becomes seat of popedom, 411. Court of, under Clement VI., 499. Immorality at, 500. Sold to Pope, 508. Consistory of, 546. Conclave at, its statutes, 547. Papal residence at concluded, 567. Siege of, vi. 47.
Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, adheres to Clovis, i. 277. His conference with Gundebald, 278.
Aussitz, battle of, vi. 249.
Autharis, king of Lombards, his wars with the Franks, i. 454. Overruns Italy—his death, 455.
Autocracy, Papal, growth of, iv. 3.
Azevedo, Bishop of Osma, iv. 251.

B.

Babylon, name applied to Rome, v. 422, 437.
'*Babylonish* captivity' ended, v. 567.
Bacon, vi. 478.
Bacon, Roger, vi. 475. At Oxford, 476. His studies, 477. Persecuted by Nicolas IV., 478. Dedicates work to Clement IV., 479. His astrology, 480. His science and discoveries, 481.
Badbee, John, burned, vi. 147.
Baldwin, Count of Flanders, joins the

crusade, iv. 132. At Zara, 142. Emperor of Constantinople, 145. His address to Pope, 152. His captivity, 158.
Ball, John, vi. 125.
Balthasar Cossa. *See* John XXIII.
Bamberg, Diet at, iv. 46. Its answer to Pope Innocent III., 47.
Bankers, Italian, v. 187.
Bannerets, at Rome, vi. 40.
Baptism, infant, question of, iv. 175. Compulsory, vi. 536.
Baptisteries, vi. 582.
Barbaric codes, affected by Christianity, i. 352. Were national, 378. Rights of persons under, 387. On slavery, 387. On slaves' marriages, 388. On the slaying of slaves, 389. On runaway slaves, 390. On adultery and divorce, 392. On property—on church property, 393. Against heresy—against witchcraft, 398.
Barbarossa, Frederick, his character, iii. 411. In Italy, 412. His coronation, 416. Holds Diet at Besançon, 418. Denounces Papal pretensions, 419. His seeming reconciliation, and march into Italy, 420. His correspondence with Hadrian IV., 422. Supports Antipope Victor IV. 431. Takes and destroys Milan, 433. Makes Paschal III. Pope, 433.
Barbiano, Alberic, vi. 19. Besieges Nocera, 24. Enters Papal service, 42.
Baroli, assembly of, iv. 332.
Barons, English, commence resistance to King John, iv. 99. Demand charter of Henry I., 102. Extort Magna Charta, 104. Pope Innocent's letter to, 105. Excommunicated, 106.
Barons, Roman, submit to Rienzi, v. 520. Are seized and pardoned, 530.
Barsumas the monk, at Synod of Ephesus, i. 203. At Council of Chalcedon, 210. His factious conduct in exile, 228.
Bartholomew of Carcassonne, iv. 238.
Basil the Macedonian, murders Michael III., and becomes Emperor, ii. 355. Calls Council at Constantinople, and deposes Bishop Photius, 356. Restores him, and dies, 357.
Basilicas, vi. 568, 572.
Basiliscus usurps Empire—favours Eutychianism—resistance to, i. 231. His fall, 232.
Basle, Council of, summoned by Martin V., vi. 239. Ambassadors from—right of voting at, 255. Inhibited by Eugenius IV., 257. Acknowledged by Pope, 259. Asserts supremacy, 262. Eminent deputies at—Bohemians at, 263. Proposes reform of clergy, 265. Dispute in, 268. Summons Pope and Cardinals, 269. Declares suspension of Pope, 270. Equips a fleet, 273. Indifference to, 284. Jealousy of Pope, 296. Quarrels in, 297. Declares deposition of Pope, 299. Appoints a Conclave, 300. Elects Felix V., 301. Dissolved, 334.
Bathildis, Queen, ii. 221.
Beatific vision, question of, v. 485.
Beatrice, married to Otho IV., iv. 59. Her death, 60.
Beaufort, Cardinal, at Constance, vi. 223.

BEC.

Leads crusade against Hussites, 238, 249. His death, 239.

Bec, Abbey of, its origin, iii. 356. Its great churchmen, 436.

Becket, his character, iii. 442. Legend of his parentage, 443. His birth and education, 445. At Rome, 447. Appointed Chancellor, 448. His power, 449. Ambassador to Paris, his splendour, 450. Elected Archbishop, 453. His change of manner, 455. Resigns chancellorship, 456. Attends Council of Tours, 457. Quarrels with Henry II., 457, 458, 459. Jealousy of, 461. At Parliament of Westminster, 462. Swears to Constitutions of Clarendon, 464. Refuses to seal them, 466. Absolved from oath by Pope, 466. Attempts to fly from kingdom, 467. Breaks his oath, 468. Cited before Council of Northampton and fined, 469. Condemned for perjury, 473. His flight, 475. Adventures, 476. Reception in France, 480. At Pontigny, 482. Cites the King, 485. Invested with legatine power, 486. At Vezelay, 487. Excommunicates Henry's adherents, 488. At Sens, 489. Controversy with English clergy, 490. His letter to Pope, 491. His quarrel with Papal legates, 494, 496. His indignation, 497. Letter to the Cardinals, 498. At Montmirail, 499. His attempted treaty with Henry II., 504. Places England under interdict, 505. King's proclamation against, 508. His letter to his suffragans, 509. Anger against the Pope, 510. Reconciliation with King, 512. Meets Henry at Tours, 514. Resistance to his restoration, 515. Lands at Sandwich, 516. Refuses absolution to Bishops, 517. Annoyed by his enemies, 518. Angry interview with the four knights, 520. Murdered, 522. Miracles, 523. Saint and martyr—King Henry's penance at tomb of, 525. Was martyr for clerical immunity, 526. Verdict of posterity upon, 527.

Bede, ii. 91. His learning and theology, ii. 92. His science, 93.

Belisarius, conquers Africa, i. 332. Enters Rome, 336.

Benedict I., Pope, i. 348.

Benedict II., Pope, ii. 139.

Benedict III., Pope, ii. 344.

Benedict IV., Pope, ii. 448.

Benedict V., Pope, ii. 471. Deposed by Otho I., banished, and dies at Hamburg, 472.

Benedict VI., Pope, murdered by Bonifazio, ii. 474.

Benedict VII., Pope, ii. 474.

Benedict VIII., Pope, ii. 501. Crowns Henry II., 502. His victories over Saracens, 502, 503.

Benedict IX., Pope, a boy, his vices, ii. 505. Sells the Papacy, 506. Reclaims it, 507. Deposed by Henry III., 508. His return and flight, iii. 5.

Benedict X., Pope, elected by Roman party, iii. 47. His flight, 48. Degradation and death, 49.

Benedict XI., his prudence, v. 267. Absolves Philip the Fair, 268. Restores the Colonnas, 269. His death, 272. Alleged to have been poisoned, 273.

BERNARD.

Benedict XII., his election and first measures, v. 488. Builds palace at Avignon, 489. Negotiates with Louis of Bavaria, 490, 491. His answer to Philip of Valois, 496. His reforms and character, 497.

Benedict XIII., vi. 38. Called on to renounce Papacy — his counter-project, 43. His obstinate refusal, 46. Besieged in his palace, 47. His imprisonment and escape, 49. His embassy to Boniface IX., 50. Letter to Gregory XII., 56. In Italy, 59. Excommunicates French King, 61. His flight, 63. In Spain, 64. His Council at Perpignan, 67. Declared deposed at Pisa, 71. His deputies at Constance, 179. His firmness, 221. His death, 222, 233.

Benedict Biscop, companion of Wilfrid, ii. 74. Builds monastery at Wearmouth—imports paintings and MSS., 81.

Benedict, Cardinal, Legate to Constantinople, iv. 158. His settlement of Latin Church, 159.

Benedict, St., of Nursia, i. 414. His age favourable to monasticism—his birth and parentage, 415. Miraculous accounts of his youth, 416, 417. His temptations, 417. His fame — his monasteries at Subiaco, 418. Plotted against by Florentius, 419. Removes to Monte Casino—his rule, 420. Enjoins labour, 421. His visions, 422. His interview with Totila, 423. His death, 424.

Benedictine convents, their rapid spread, in Italy, i. 424. In France, 425. In England, 426.

Benedictines in England, iii. 116.

Benefices, sale of, vi. 36.

Benevento, admits Leo IX., iii. 44. Battle of, v. 65. Sack of, 66.

Benzo, iii. 69. His influence at Rome, and invectives against Hildebrand, 70.

Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, ii. 462. King of Italy, 463, 466. Taken prisoner by Otho I., 470.

Berengar, Duke of Friuli, ii. 609. Defeated by Guido, 410. His war with Louis of Provence, 450. Crowned Emperor at Rome, 454. Murdered, 456.

Berengar of Tours, a pupil of Erigena, iii. 22. His opinions on the Real Presence, 23. At council of Vercelli, 25. Condemned by council of Paris - submits, 26. His recantation—revokes it, 51. Renews question of Transubstantiation, 182. Acquitted by Gregory VII., 183.

Berengaria, Queen of Leon, iv. 114.

Berenger de Talon, v. 439.

Bernabo Visconti, his crimes, v. 556.

Bernard, S., iii. 327. His youth, 333. At Citeaux, 334. Founds Clairvaux, 335. His miracles, 336. Embraces cause of Innocent II., 337, 342. Jealous of Abélard, 367. Opposes him at Sens, 372. His letter to Innocent II., 375. Persecutes Arnold of Brescia, 390. His power over Eugenius III., 396. Interferes in archbishopric of York, 397. Preaches the Crusade, 399. Persuades Louis VII. and Emperor Conrad to take the Cross, 400. Protects Jews, 401. His Crusade fails, 402. His death, 403. Silences heresies in the south of France, iv. 178. His con-

quest transitory, 192. His address to Templars, v. 287. Hymns ascribed to, vi. 492.

Bernard, Count de Foix, iv. 221.

Bernard de Goth. *See* Clement V.

Bernhard, grandson of Charlemagne, ii. 311. King in Italy, 314. His unsuccessful rebellion. 318, and death, 319.

Bernhard, Duke of Septimania, ii. 325. His flight, 326, and return, 328.

Bertha, a Frankish princess, ii. 56. Queen of Ethelbert, ii. 57.

Bertha, wife of Adalbert of Tuscany, ii. 449. Her ambitious intrigues, 450.

Berthold, Regent of Naples, iv. 462. His weakness and treachery, 463.

Bertholdt of Winterthur, his preaching, vi. 553.

Besançon, diet at, iii. 418.

Bessarion of Nicea, vi. 286–288. Cardinal, 348.

Beziers, siege of, iv. 210.

Beziers, Viscount of, his defence of Carcassonne, iv. 210. Dies in prison, 211.

Bianca Lancia, mistress of Frederick II., iv. 320.

Bible, Hebrew, vi. 624. Interpretation of, 633. Versions of:—Vulgate, i. 74. Gothic, 272. — Moravian, ii. 427. Provençal, iv. 185. Wycliffe's, vi. 123, 545, 625. New, 351. German, 532.

Biblical Antisacerdotalists, iv. 181. Criticism, vi. 624.

Biordo, chief of Condottieri, vi. 39. Assassinated, 40.

Birinus, first Bishop of Dorchester, ii. 67.

Bishops under Teutons, become warlike, i. 289. Their mixed character, 290. Grow into a separate order, 291. How elected, 383. Their municipal authority, 385. Their power, 403. Appointed by Emperor, ii. 296. Under Justinian's code, 357. Ordered to inspect prisons—to suppress gaming, 376.

Bishops, English, in civil war of Stephen and Matilda, iii. 440. Their warlike character, 441. Their advice to Becket, 471. Their controversy with Becket, 490. Address the Pope, 491. Their hesitation, 502. Their fear of Interdict, 508. Excommunicated, 518. Satires on, vi. 503.

Bishoprics of Anglo-Saxons, ii. 99.

Bishoprics, English, law of election to, iii. 464.

Blanche of Castile, Regent of France, v. 4. Her death, 15.

Blastus raises the Easter question at Rome —deposed by Pope Victor, i. 35.

Bobbio, monastery of, ii. 108.

Boccaccio, vi. 513. His 'Decamerone,' 517.

Boethius, a Roman, minister of Theodoric, i. 319. His trial and imprisonment, 320. Composes the 'Consolation of Philosophy,' 323. His cruel death, 324.

Bogoris, King of Bulgaria, his conversion, ii. 419. Quells insurrection, 420. Applies to Pope Nicolas I. 421.

Bohemia, conversion of, ii. 428. Policy of Pope Innocent III. towards, iv. 120. Connexion of with England, vi. 139, 164. Wycliffism in, 154. Isolation of, 163. Indignation in at death of Huss, 212. Hussite war in, 245. Rises against Sigismund, 247.

Bohemians, their memorial to Council of Constance, vi. 201. At Basle, 263. Dissensions among, 264. Reverses, 264.

Bologna, John XXIII. Legate in, vi. 82. Conclave at, 83.

Bonaventura, St., General of Franciscans, v. 48. His alleged refusal of papacy, 86. Dies, 91. One of the great Schoolmen, vi. 449. Mysticism of, 464, 465. His Hymn of the Cross, 491.

Boniface I., Pope, his disputed election, i. 135. His character, 136.

Boniface II., contest at his election, i. 333. Attempts to nominate his successor, 334.

Boniface III., assumes title of 'Universal Bishop,' ii. 121.

Boniface IV., ii. 122.

Boniface V., ii. 122.

Boniface VIII. (Benedetto Gaetani), rebukes Charles the Lame, v. 131. His ascendancy at Naples, 138. His election, 147. Imprisons Cœlestine V., 150. His views of Papal authority, 152. His experiences as Legate, 153. His advances to Frederick of Arragon, 156. Summons Charles of Valois to Italy, 159. His jealousy of the Colonnas, 160. Excommunicates the Colonnas, 164. His measures in Italy, 167. Excommunicates Albert of Austria, 171. Forbids wars of Edward I., 181. Issues bull 'Clericis Laicos,' 189. Second bull against Philip the Fair, 196-198. Philip's reply to, 198. Arbiter between France and England, 204. Forbids Edward's Scotch wars, 205. Institutes Jubilee, 209. At the height of his power, 211. His enemies, 212. Estranges Franciscans, 213. Persecutes Fraticelli, 215. Abandons Scots, 220. His quarrel with Philip of France, 221. Rumours of his pride, 224. Sends Legate to France, 225. Receives embassy from King Philip, 229. His bulls against Philip, 230, 231, 233. Address of French clergy to, 237. His reply, 238. His speech before Consistory, 239. Issues bull 'Unam Sanctam,' 241. Acknowledges Albert of Austria Emperor, 244. Acknowledges Frederick of Sicily, 244. Offers terms to Philip, 245. Excommunicates Philip, 248. Charges made against him at Paris, 254. At Anagni, 257. His replies to charges, 258. Attacked, 261, and imprisoned, 262. Rescued, returns to Rome, 263. Revolt against — his death — general shock at treatment of, 264. His memory persecuted by Philip, 270, 363. His defenders, 367. Opening of proceedings, 368. Witnesses against, 370. Alleged blasphemy, 371. Conversation with Roger Loria, 373. Charged with magic and idolatry, 374. Summary of evidence against, 375. Judgment of Clement V., 377. His innocence declared by Council of Vienne, 381.

Boniface IX., his election, vi. 33. Supports Ladislaus of Naples, 34. His simony, 35, and nepotism, 36. His able conduct, 39. Returns to Rome, 40. His successes, 42. Receives embassy from Benedict XIII., 50. His death, 51.

Boniface, St., his birth and early life, ii. 109. Goes to Rome—countenanced by Pope Gregory II., 110. Protected by Charles Martel, 110. Goes to Thuringia—to Friesland, 111, to the Saxons and Hessians — fells the oak of Geismar, 112. Archbishop of Mentz, 113. His proceedings in Germany, 114. Death and burial at Fulda, 115. His charges against Frankish clergy, 237.

Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, v. 27. Tyranny of, 28.

Bonifazio, murders Benedict VI.—assumes Papacy—flies to Constantinople, ii. 474. Seizes John XIV., puts him to death in prison, and assumes the Papacy — dies, 475.

Books, imported into England, ii. 81. Growing influence of, vi. 626.

Bordeaux, appointed combat at, v. 118. Scene at, 121.

Boso, Duke of Lombardy, adopted by Pope John VIII. as his son, ii. 402. Made King of Provence, 403.

Bosra, taken by Mohammedans, ii. 30.

Boucicaut, Marshal, at Avignon, vi. 46. Besieges Papal Palace, 47.

Bourges, Synod of, vi. 282.

Bouvines, battle of, iv. 61, 102.

Braccio Montone, vi. 233.

Bradwardine, teacher of divinity, vi. 103.

Brancaleone, Senator of Rome, iv. 459. Summons Pope to Rome, 460. His imprisonment and release, v. 20. Marches against Pope, his death, 30.

Breakspear, Nicolas. *See* Hadrian IV.

Bremen and Hamburg, archbishopic of, ii. 437.

Bremen burnt by Hungarians, ii. 445.

Brescia, revolutions in, iii. 386. Arnold's preaching in, 387. Siege of, iv. 385. Revolt of, v. 388. Taken by Henry of Luxemburg, 389.

Bribery, Papal, vi. 329.

Britain, monasticism in, i. 414. Benedictine convents in, 426. First conversion of, ii. 54. Heathenised by Saxons, 56. Partially converted by Augustine, 61. Its relapse, 61, and recovery, 62.

British church, remnant of in Wales, ii. 60. Disputes of with Roman clergy, 61.

Brito, Reginald, iii. 519.

Brixen, Synod of, deposes Gregory VII., iii. 188. Elects Guibert Pope, 189.

Brotherhoods, secret religious, vi. 556.

Bruce, Robert, excommunicated by Clement V., v. 283.

Brueys, Peter de, iv. 175.

Bruges, meeting of English and Papal deputies at, vi. 112.

Brunehaut, her vices—rebuked by S. Columban, ii. 104.

Brunelleschi, vi. 602.

Bruno. *See* Leo IX.

Bruno, kinsman of Otho III., made Pope, ii. 478. Flies from Rome, 479. His restoration and death, 482.

Bulgaria, Paulicians in, iv. 188.

Bulgarians, defeated by Leo the Armenian, ii. 192. Manners of, 420. Their conversion disputed between East and West, 424.

Threaten Constantinople, iv. 158. Their king Johannitius, 160.

Bull, Papal, 'Clericis Laicos,' v. 189. Read in English cathedrals, 191. Its reception in France, 194. Its revocation, 280.

Bull, second, of Boniface VIII., v. 196.

Bull forbidding invasion of Scotland, v. 206.

Bull of Boniface VIII. against Philip the Fair, v. 229, 230.

Bull, the Lesser, v. 231. Its probable genuineness, 232.

Bull, the Greater, v. 233. Burned in Paris, 234.

Bull, 'Unam Sanctam,' v. 241. Its revocation, 280.

Bull issued at Anagni, v. 258.

Bull of Clement V., v. 306. Against France, 376.

Bull of Nicolas IV. on Absolute Poverty, v. 430. Annulled by John XXII., 441.

Bull of John XXII. against Franciscans, v. 440.

Bull, the 'Golden,' v. 549.

Bull of Alexander V. in favour of Friars, vi. 76.

Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt, iii. 130. His escape, 158.

Burdinus (or Maurice), Archbishop of Braga, iii. 304.

Burgundian law, i. 380.

Burgundians, conversion of, i. 273.

Burgundy, power of, vi. 159.

Butillo, nephew of Urban VI., vi. 23. His cruelty to cardinals, 26. Taken prisoner in Nocera, 27. Liberated by Queen Margaret, 29.

Byzantine architecture, vi. 570. Painting, 604, 610.

C.

Caaba, the, ii. 17.

Cadalous, Antipope, iii. 69. Occupies St. Angelo, 77. Flies from Rome, 82. Rejected by Council of Mantua; dies, 83.

Cædmon, ii. 94. His religious songs, 95. His poetry continued by Alfred, 443.

Cæsarini, Cardinal, President of Council of Basle, vi. 252. His letter to Eugenius IV., 253. Meets Greek Emperor at Venice, 276

Caliphs, the earliest, ii. 35.

Calixtus I., Pope, his early history, i. 43, 44. Influence over Zephyrinus, 44. Obtains the Popedom, 45. Opposed by Hippolytus, 45, 46.

Calixtus II. (Guido of Vienne), Pope, iii. 309. Holds Council at Rheims — renews Truce of God, 311. His meeting with Henry V., 313. Breaks off negotiations, 314. Excommunicates Henry V.—meets Henry I. of England, 315. His triumphant return to Rome, 316. Degrades Gregory VIII., 317. Consents to Concordat of Worms, 319. Pacifies Rome—his death, 323.

Calixtus III., Antipope, iii. 534. Abdicates, 538.

Callistus III., Pope, vi. 348.

Camatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, his

flight, iv. 148. Takes refuge at Nicea, 156.
Campaniles, vi. 582.
Can della Scala, Chief of Verona, v. 449. His death, 479.
Candidianus, President of Council of Ephesus, i. 159.
Canonisation, vi. 418.
Canosa, Gregory VII. and Henry IV. at, iii. 167.
Canterbury, monks of, reluctant to elect Becket, iii. 453. Election to Archbishopric of, iv. 82, 351. Archbishops of, vi. 98.
Canterbury Tales, vi. 547.
Canute, his pilgrimage to Rome, ii. 504.
Capet, Hugh, ii. 487.
Carcassonne, capture of, iv. 211.
Cardinals, college of, its germ in the third century, i. 42. Made Papal electors, iii. 49. Remonstrate with Eugenius III., 398. Address of French barons to, v. 236. Their reply, 237. King Philip's embassy to, 270.
Cardinals, French, 280, 546. Their dismay at Pope's return to Rome, 559. At Rome, vi. 4. At Anagni, 12.
Cardinals, Italian, v. 408. Elect Urban III., vi. 7. Violence of Romans towards, 8. Their discontent, 11. At Anagni, 12. Arrest of by Urban VI., 25. Tortured, 26. Death of, 27. At Avignon, 46. Their embassy to Paris, 47. Summon council, 64. At Constance, contest with Emperor, 222. Pledge themselves to reform, 241. Satires on, 503.
Carloman enters monastery of Monte Casino, ii. 232. His imprisonment and death, 241.
Carloman, son of Pepin, his part in Roman factions, ii. 253. Jealous of his brother Charles, 254. His death, 258.
Carloman, son of Louis the Germanic —King of Italy, ii. 399. Dies, 402.
Carloman, son of Charles the Bald, ii. 386. An abbot—heads a band of robbers, 386. His deposition, 390. Is blinded, and dies, 391.
Carlovingian empire, extinction of, ii. 408.
Carroccio of Milan, iii. 58. Taken at Corte Nuova, iv. 383.
Carolinian books, ii. 302. Sent to Pope Hadrian I., 303.
Carpentras, conclave at, v. 407.
Carthage, church of, its intercourse with that of Rome, i. 47; and subsequent dispute, 52. Council at, under Cyprian, 53.
Carthage, Council of, resists decision of Pope Zosimus, i. 123. Appeals to Honorius, 124.
Casale, Ubertino di, v. 438.
Cassianus, i. 128. His attachment to Chrysostom—a semi-Pelagian—opposed by Augustinians, 130.
Castile, affairs of, iv. 113. Threatened with interdict, 114.
Castruccio of Lucca, v. 449, 463-470. Created senator of Rome, 471. His death, 477.
Cathari, v. 34.
Catherine of Courtenay, nominal heiress to Greek empire, v. 156.
Catherine, S., of Sienna, her mission to Avignon, v. 565; to Florence, 566.

Catholic church united, i. 314. Jealous of Theodoric, 316 — measures of in the East, 316. Alleged conspiracies of at Rome, 317.
Ceadwalla, ii. 65. His conquest of Sussex—his conversion, 86. Goes to Rome for absolution —dies, 87.
Cecco d'Ascoli, astrologer, burned, v. 469.
'*Celestial* Hierarchy,' vi. 403. Belief in, 405. Greek origin of, 406.
Celestine I., Pope, i. 137. Pronounces against Nestorius, 153. Sends envoys to Constantinople, 154. Excommunicates Nestorius, 155. His letters to the Council of Ephesus, 166.
Celestius, a follower of Pelagius, i. 110. Appeals to Pope Zosimus, 122. Is declared orthodox, 123. Subsequently condemned, 125.
Celibacy, honour of, i. 468.
Celibacy of clergy, i. 76; iv. 243. Resistance to, i. 77. Prevents degeneracy of church, iii. 108. Consequences of, vi. 357. Its effect on morals, 384.
Celidonius—his appeal to Rome, i. 193.
Cencius seizes Pope Gregory VII., iii. 145. His flight, 146.
Cencius, Consul of Rome, iii. 204.
Cery, crusade of, iv. 132.
Cesena, Michael di, general of Franciscans, his argument, v. 441. At Avignon, 442. Joins Louis of Bavaria, 478.
Cesena, Massacre of, v. 566; vi. 30.
Chadijah, wife of Mohammed, ii. 15. His first convert, 17.
Chalcedon, Synod of, i. 170.
Chalcedon, Council of, reverses sentence of Synod of Ephesus, i. 208. Condemns Dioscorus, 209. Its decrees confirmed by Emperor Marcian, 210. Equalizes Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, 211.
Champeaux, William of, iii. 360.
Chancery, Papal, vi. 225.
Chapters, 'The Three,' i. 340. Disputes about, 342. Condemned by Vigilius, 344.
Charity of clergy, vi. 383.
Charlemagne marries Hermingard, ii. 254. Divorces her — marries Hildegard, 257. Sole King, 258. Besieges Pavia, 260. At Rome—his Donation to Pope Hadrian I., 261. Destroys the Lombard kingdom, 262. His second visit to Rome, 264. Suppresses rebellions, 265. Crowned by Pope—consequences of this act, 270. His league with the Pope, 272. Extent of his empire, 275. His power personal, 277. His character, 279. His wives, 299. His Saxon wars, 280. Destroys the Irmin-Saule, 283. His successes, 85. Founds bishoprics, 286. His ecclesiastical legislation, 287, 293. Supremacy over church, 289. Grants to the church, 290. His Institutes, 293. Rules for monasteries, 294. For church government, 295. For election of bishops, 296; and of parochial clergy, 297. Holds Council of Frankfort, 299. His measures strengthen Papacy, 306. Literature of, 307. His death, 310. His defences against Northmen neglected after his death, 429. Legends of, vi. 524. Conversions by, 531.

Charles Martel, protects S. Boniface, ii. 110. His victory at Tours, 214. Hated by the Frankish clergy, 219, 226. His violation of Church property, 226. His death, 227.

Charles the Bald, his birth, ii. 325. Seizes kingdom of Lorraine, 383. Combines with his brother Louis, 385. His sons, 386. Usurps empire; crowned by Pope John VIII., 393. His defeat by Louis of Saxony, and death, 394.

Charles the Fat crowned Emperor, ii. 404. His death, 408.

Charles of Lorraine, ii. 488.

Charles of Anjou, his treaty with Urban IV., v. 57. Senator of Rome, 60. At Rome, 63. His victory at Benevento, 65. His tyranny, 67. Letter of Clement IV. to, 74. Defeats and puts to death Conradin, 79. His barbarity, 82. His designs on Constantinople, 99. Procures election of Martin IV., 101. His ambition, 103. His preparations against Peter of Arragon, 110. His conduct during Sicilian insurrection, 113. Lays siege to Messina, 115. Evacuates Sicily, 117. At Bordeaux, 121. His reverses and death, 122.

Charles II. of Naples (the Lame), taken prisoner, v. 122. Surrenders claim to Sicily, 124. His liberation, 126. Show of deference to Cœlestine V., 134. Gets Pope into his power, 137. His treaty with James of Arragon, 155. His enmity to Templars, 352.

Charles III. of Naples, vi. 20. Conducts Urban VI. to Naples, 22. Gonfalonier of the Church, 23. Quarrels with Pope, 24. Besieges Nocera, 27. Murdered, 28.

Charles of Valois, his fruitless attempt upon Arragon, v. 122. Surrenders his claim, 156. Invades Sicily, 159. His victories in Flanders, 202. His alliance damages Pope, 210. Seeks the empire, 308.

Charles the Fair, his divorce and marriage, v. 456. His attempt on empire, 459.

Charles IV. (of Moravia), proclaimed King of Romans, v. 506. His flight at Crecy, 507. Proposals of Rienzi to, 538. His answer, 539. Goes to Italy, 549. Issues the Golden Bull, 549. Visits Avignon, 559. At Rome, 560. King of Bohemia, vi. 163.

Charles VI. of France, attempts to end schism, vi. 42. Acknowledges Benedict XIII., 50. Proclaims neutrality between Popes, 63.

Chastity, laws for protection of, iv. 365.

Chaucer, vi. 536, an *English* poet, 545. His travels, reading, and poetry, 546. Creator of native poetry, 547. His pictures of ecclesiastics, 548. Imprisonment of, 549.

Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury, instigates Henry V. to war, vi. 236. Letter of Martin V. to, 237.

Chilperic deposed, ii. 235.

Chivalry, iii. 237. Its origin in the Crusades, 257. Of the Saracens, 256. Adopts worship of Virgin, vi. 414.

Chlum, De, Bohemian noble, protects Huss, vi. 169, 171. Supports him at Constance, 202, 203.

Christ, sculptured representations of in churches, vi. 593. Traditional representations of, 606, 607. Represented as judge 607.

Christendom, three systems of law in, i. 354. State of at accession of Innocent III. iv. 12. Seeming peace of under Innocent III., 169. Public opinion in, 397. Advance of in the North, v. 405. Contest in, 475. Indignant at Papal schism, vi. 61.

Christian morals, controversy on, i. 45. Jurisprudence, 351, 352. It is mixed with secular, 353. Europe, unity of, vi. 381. Literature, 434. Terms, Teutonic, 527. Latin terms, 529.

Christian mythology, *see* Legends.

Christianity, in its origin Greek, i. 1. Its progressive development, 10. Teutonic, 9. In Rome; its growth, 23. Obscurity of, 24. Its early influence on morals, 24. Its apparent failure to produce good, 255. Its innate goodness and power, 256. Becomes warlike, 264. Barbarised by Teutonic conquests, 280. Its effect on Roman law, 351. Its special jurisprudence, 352. Introduces new crimes, 376, 398. Its dependence on Papacy, 429. Asiatic, its decline, ii. 5. In Arabia, imperfect, 26. Eastern, its want of energy, 38. Feeble resistance to Mohammedism, 39. Humiliation of, 41, 42. Effect of Mohammedan conquests on, 50. The only bond of union in Europe, 53. Its extension in the West, 54. In Britain, 54. Unites the Anglo-Saxons, 99. In Sweden, 439. Allied to military spirit, iii. 237. Popular articles of, vi. 399. Adapted to humanity, 628.

Christopher, Pope, ii. 448.

Chronicles, vi. 505.

Chronology of first four centuries, i. 11–17. Fifth century, 80. Sixth century, 222, 223. Seventh and eighth centuries, ii. 2. From A.D. 800 to 1050, 274. Eleventh century, iii. 2, 96. Twelfth century, 257, 258. Of Innocent III., iv. 2. Thirteenth century, 282; v. 2. Fourteenth century, 274. Fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, vi. 2.

Chrysaphius, the Eunuch, minister of Theodosius II., his intrigues, i. 201.

Chrysostom, translated from Antioch to Constantinople, i. 91. Incurs enmity of Arcadius—appeals to Pope and Western Bishops, 92. Supported by Innocent I. and Emperor Honorius, 93.

Church, Royal supremacy over, i. 354. Growing power of after Charlemagne, ii. 326. Jealous of empire in Papal elections, iii. 6. Its power and wealth lead to simony, 106. Enriched by crusades, 246. Its jealousy of law, iv. 369. The, definition of, v. 464. Great field for ambition, vi. 101.

Church-building, vi. 575, 576. Incentives for, 577. Good effects of, 580.

Church property, secured by Constantine, i. 372. By other Emperors, 373, 374, 375. Rapid growth and inviolability of, 373, 375. Alarming increase of in France, 393. Liable to taxation, 394. Taxed under Becket's chancellorship, iii. 432. Various kinds of, vi. 364. Extent of, 366.

Church services, settled by Gregory the Great, i. 439. Effect of on languages, vi. 523.

CHURCHES.

Churches, sanctity of, i. 472. Burial in, 473. In Latin Christendom, vi. 563. In Rome, 568. In Constantinople, 569. At Ravenna, 571. Of Venice and Lombardy, 572. For the priests, 577. Splendour of, 579. The people's, 579. Mediæval, influence of, 594.

Cimabue, vi. 612.

Circus, contests of, revived by Justinian, i. 329.

Cisalpine architecture, vi. 565.

Cistercian order, iii. 332. Monks, legates in South of France, iv. 194.

Citeaux, monks of, iii. 332.

Cities under Frederick II., iv. 363.

Clairvaux, Abbey of, founded by S. Bernard, iii. 335. Innocent II. visits, 339.

Clara founds Poor Sisterhood at Assisi, iv. 266.

Clarendon, Council of, iii. 463. Constitutions of, 464. Condemned by Alexander III., 480.

Claudian, his poems on Stilicho—his silence about Christianity, i. 94.

Claudius of Turin, ii. 339.

Clement II., Pope, iii. 3. Crowns Henry III. Emperor—attempts to reform Church, 4. Dies, 5.

Clement III. reconciled to Romans, iii. 544.

Clement IV., legate to England, v. 58. Holds court at Boulogne, 59. Chosen Pope, 62. Supports Charles of Anjou, v. 62. Commands crusade against English Barons, 68. His legate in England, 70. His treatment of James of Arragon, 73. Declaration against Conradin—advice to Charles of Anjou, 74. Accused of counselling death of Conradin, 80. Dies, 81. Countenances Roger Bacon, vi. 479.

Clement V. (Bernard de Goth), v. 277. His secret compact with Philip the Fair, v. 278. Elected Pope—coronation at Lyons, 279. His measures in French interest, 280, 284. Absolves Edward I. from oaths, 283. Excommunicates Robert Bruce, 283. His embarrassment, 284. Consents to call Council of Vienne, 285. Absolves William of Nogaret, 285. Summons Grand-masters of Military orders, 291. His indignation at the arrest of Templars, 305. His Bull to Edward II., 306. His alarm at power of the Valois, 308. His dissimulation, 309. His vacillation in the matter of the Templars, 312, 314. Appoints commission, 316. His involved position, 355, and weakness, 356. At Avignon—fails to retard proceedings against Boniface VIII., 363. His difficulties, 364. Correspondence with Philip, 365. Claims sole jurisdiction in matter of Boniface VIII., 366. Opens consistory at Avignon, 368. Examines witnesses, 369. Is permitted to pronounce judgment, 375. His Bull, 376, and judgment, 377. Holds Council of Vienne, 378. Lays Venice under interdict, 385. His league with Henry of Luxemburg, 386. His death—his wealth and nepotism, 398. Decline of Papacy in him, 399. Review of his Popedom and policy, 400. Persecution of heretics under, 434. Dispute about his wealth, 435.

CLERGY.

Clement VI., his first acts, v. 498. His splendid court, 499. Nepotism of, 500. Excommunicates Louis of Bavaria, 502, 505. Supports Charles of Moravia, 506. His declaration against Rienzi, 533. Speech in defence of Mendicants—his death, 546.

Clement VII. (Robert of Geneva) commands mercenaries in Italy, v. 564. Sacks Faenza and Cesena, 566. At conclave at Rome, vi. 5. Elected Antipope, 15. His acts—flies from Naples, 18. Crowns Louis of Anjou King of Naples, 21. At Avignon, 30. Deputation to, from University of Paris, 37. His death, 38.

Clementina, The, origin of, i. 33. Judaism of, 33. Hatred to St. Paul betrayed therein, 34.

Clergy encourage superstition, i. 291. Laws of Justinian for, 356. In the west were Latin, 401. Delinquencies of, 405. Sanctity of, miraculously asserted, 472. Low-born, encouraged by Louis the Pious, ii. 333. Inferior, insecurity of, 377. Plundered by Northmen, 433. Hereditary, danger of, iii. 109. Their luxury, 382. Their relations with people, iv. 243. Taxation of, 311, v. 90. Their hatred of Mendicants, vi. 75. Administrative influence of, 360. Their spiritual power, 361. Their wealth, 367. Unity, 376. Their common language, 378. Ubiquity, 379. Unite Europe, 380. Effects of on social rank, 381. Of low birth, 382. Charity of—assert equality of mankind, 383. Morals of, 385. Buildings of, 575.

Clergy, celibacy of, iv. 243. vi. 384.

Clergy, marriage of, allowed in the Greek church, i. 45, and in the early Roman, 46. Maintained at Milan, iii. 61. Condemned by Stephen IX., 66. Prevalence of, 67. Continued strife about, 83-89. Urged upon Council of Basle, vi. 259.

Clergy, married, in Italy, iii. 110. In Germany, 111. In France, 112. In England, 114; v. 72. Harsh decree of Gregory VII. against, iii. 141. Their resistance in France, 143.

Clergy, English, their benefits to civilization, ii. 90. Remonstrate against Papal exactions, iv. 400. Subordinate to King's courts, v. 175. Approve measures of Edward I., 178. Taxation of, 182. Refuse subsidy, 190. Are outlawed—they yield, 191. Guardians of national liberties, v. 193. Subject to civil laws, vi. 94. Alien, petition against, 115. Promote French wars, 236. Piers Ploughman on, 540. Of Chaucer, 548.

Clergy, French, obey Papal Interdict, iv. 68. Contempt of in Provence, 192. In crusade against heretics, 204, 223. At Lateran Council, 229. Taxation of, v. 189. Their submission to Philip the Fair, 201.

Clergy, German, how elected under Charlemagne, ii. 297. Their revenues, 298.

Clergy, Roman, impress Teutons with respect, i. 265. Their self-devotion, 266, and patience, 267. Their influence in wars of Franks, 280. Look upon Franks as deliverers, 281. Continue distinct, 282. Indulge vices of Teutonic princes, 287. Sub-

ject to common law among Teutons, 380, 384. Admitted to national councils, 385. Their position as mediators, 386.

Clergy, in Sicily, laws of Frederick II. about, iv. 362.

Clergy, immunities of. *See* Immunities.

Clerical crimes, iii. 460. Jurisdiction separate, established by William the Conqueror, 465.

Clermont, Council of, iii. 231. Determines on crusade, 234.

Climate, as affecting architecture, vi. 591.

Cloistral painters, vi. 616.

Clotilda, Queen of Clovis, i. 275. Is the means of Clovis' conversion, 276.

Clovis, a pagan Frankish chief, i. 274. Marries Clotilda, 275. His conversion, 276. The only orthodox sovereign, 277. His religious wars against Burgundians, 278. Against Visigoths, 279. His ferocity and perfidy, 279.

Clugny, abbey of, its degeneracy, iii. 331.

Cobham, Lord, vi. 148. His trial, 150. Escapes, 151. His arrest and execution, 153.

Code of Justinian. *See* Justinian.

Codes previous to Justinian, i. 355.

Cœlestine II. (Guido di Castello), a friend of Abélard, iii. 376. Protects Arnold of Brescia, 389. Elected Pope—his death, 392.

Cœlestine III., crowns Emperor Henry VI., iii. 546. Queen Eleanor's letters to, 549. Excommunicates Emperor, 552. Removes excommunication after Henry's death, 554.

Cœlestine IV., his election and death, iv. 417.

Cœlestine V. (Peter Morrone), his monasticism, v. 131, and visions, 132. Receives announcement of his election, 133. His reluctance, 134. Inauguration, 135. At Naples, 136. His hermit followers, 137, 142. Becomes a tool of Charles the Lame, 137. Abdicates, 139. Legality of the act doubted, 140. Seized and imprisoned—dies, 150. His canonization, 151.

Cœlestinians, v. 151. Unite with Fraticelli, 214.

Coin, debasement of, v. 282.

Colleges, foundation of, vi. 393.

Cologne, tumults in, iii. 135. Burning of heretics at, 190.

Colonna, Cardinal, iv. 412.

Colonna, James, v. 472.

Colonna, Otto. *See* Martin V.

Colonna, Sciarra, in Italy, v. 259. His attack on Boniface VIII., 261. Violent conduct, 262. Excepted from Papal pardon—Captain of Roman people, 470. His flight, 477. Death, 479.

Colonna, Stephen, his submission to Rienzi, v. 520.

Colonnas, v. 124. Their ascendancy, 128. Boniface VIII. jealous of, 160. Their power, 161. Papal Bull against, 162. Their reply, 163. Excommunicated, 164. Their castles taken, 165. Their flight, 166. Excluded from Jubilee, 210. Received by King of France, 224. Their calumnies against Boniface VIII., 255. Restored by Benedict XI., 269. Under Roman republic, 529. Defeated by Rienzi, 531.

Columban, S., ii. 100. His birth, 101. His travels, 101, 102. Founds monastery at Luxeuil, 102, and abbey of Fontaines—his dispute with Gaulish Bishops, 103. Rebukes King Thierri, and Queen Brunehaut, 104, 105. Is banished, 105. Returns to France, 106. His strife with pagans in Switzerland — removes to Bregenz, 107. Thence to Bobbio, 108.

Comedies, religious, vi. 497.

Commendams, vi. 225.

Commissioners, Papal, at Montmirail, iii. 498.

Commissioners in the matter of the Templars, v. 316. Their sittings at Paris, 320. Call on Templars to appoint proctors, 326. Continue examinations, 334. Adjourn, 335.

Commodus, reign of, i. 36. Toleration of Christianity—death, 37.

Commons, English, petition against hierarchy, vi. 108. Petition Henry IV., 370.

Commons of France, v. 310.

Conception, Immaculate, vi. 416.

Conceptualism of Abélard, iii. 379.

Concubinage legalized, i. 369. Of clergy, iii. 9.

Concordat of Worms, iii. 319.

Concordats of Martin V. not accepted by nations, vi. 229.

Confession, auricular, iv. 243; vi. 361.

Conon, Pope, ii. 139.

Conon, Cardinal of Præneste, iii. 301.

Conrad the Salic, tumults at his coronation, ii. 504. His coronation at Milan, iii. 56.

Conrad III., Emperor, invited by Roman insurgents, iii. 391. Takes the cross, 400.

Conrad, son of Henry IV., his character, iii. 213. His league with Papal faction—accuses his father—is crowned King of Italy, 214. Marries a Norman princess, 218. Dis inherited by Henry, 262. His death, 265.

Conrad, King of Italy, alliance with Otho of Bavaria, iv. 443. Defeated by Henry of Thuringia, 445. Excommunicated, 455. Obtains possession of Naples, 458. Jealous of Manfred, 461. His death, 462.

Conrad of Lutzenberg, iv. 19. His submission to Innocent III., 20.

Conrad, Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 39. His death, 41.

Conrad, Bishop of Wurtzburg, iv. 49. His murder, 50.

Conradin, infant son and successor of Conrad, iv. 462; v. 73. Supported by Romans, 76. His successes, 77. Enters Rome, 78. Defeated and put to death, 79.

'*Consolations* of Philosophy,' i. 323. Its want of Christianity, 324.

Constance, treaty of, iii. 539. Town of, vi. 91.

Constance, Council of, 155. Preparations for, 156. Objects of, 160. Sermon before, 172. Number of Clergy at, 175. Good order, 176. Receives deputies from antipopes, 179. Right of suffrage, 180. Proposal for a new Pope, 185. Quarrel, 186. Tumult, 189. Declares itself supreme, 190. Decrees of, 193. Cites the Pope — declares his deposition, 196. Its views of church reform,

138. Condemns Wycliffe, 200. Sends to interrogate Huss, 201. Appearance of Huss before, 202. Pronounces against administration of cup to laity, 208. Sentences Huss, 210. Its leniency to Pope John XXIII., 217. Censures doctrine of Jean Petit, 219. Contest of with Benedict XIII., 221. Divisions in, 222, 223. Endeavours for reform, 227. Conclusion of, 230. Results, 231. Unanimous against heresy, 232.

Constans I., i. 62.

Constans II., his jealous cruelty, ii. 129. Withdraws the Ecthesis, 130. Arrests Pope Martin I., 132. Murders his brother Theodosius, 134. At Rome—plunders the churches—dies at Syracuse, 135.

Constantia, heiress of Sicily, marries Henry V., iii. 541. Taken by Tancred, and released, 548. Her mildness, 553. Swears allegiance to Pope, iv. 21. Makes Innocent III. guardian of her son—dies, 22.

Constantine, conversion of, i. 56. Grants privileges to Roman church, 57. Porphyry font of, v. 525. Churches of, vi. 568.

Constantine III., ii. 127. His death, 128.

Constantine the Bearded, Emperor—summons council at Constantinople, ii. 136.

Constantine Copronymus, Emperor, ii. 167. Takes Constantinople, 168. Follows up the plans of Leo—calls third council of Constantinople, 170. His severity—persecutes monks, 175. His cruelty to Patriarch, 178. His character and death, 179.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus, his accession and minority, ii. 181. His contest with his mother Irene, 189. Seized and blinded, 191. His death, 192.

Constantine, Pope, his dispute with Bishop of Ravenna, ii. 141. At Constantinople, 142.

Constantine usurps Popedom—deposed, ii. 250. Blinded, and cruelly treated, 251.

Constantine, Bishop of Sylæum, made Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 174. Degraded by the Emperor, 177. Cruel treatment of and death, 178.

Constantine, founder of Paulicians, iv. 187.

Constantinople, foundation of, i. 58. Nestorian question in, 151. Bishop of, dependent on the Court, 212. Revolutions in, mixed up with religion, 230. Tumults in, 244. Claims supremacy of Church, 450. Revolutions at, on death of Heraclius, ii. 127. Council of, condemns monothelitism, 137. Tumults in, against iconoclasm, 157. Third council of, condemns image-worship, 171, 173. Revolutions in, iv. 137. Taken by Crusaders, 145. Partition of, 146. Sacked, 149. Effects of conquest of, 162. Taken by Turks, vi. 347. Roman art in, 569. Justinian's buildings in, 570.

Constantius, i. 61. His contest with Pope Liberius, 64, 65.

Contemplation of God, vi. 439.

Contributions to Crusades, iv. 126. Application of, 132.

Controversy about Easter, i. 35. Christian morals, 45. Lapsi, 48, 319. Novatian, 50. Re-baptism of heretics, 52. Trinitarian, 60. Pelagian, 110. Semi-Pelagian, 132. Nestorian, 140, 151. Priscillianite, 197. Eutychian, 230. Of the three chapters, 340. Monothelite, ii. 123. Of iconoclasm, 144. Of marriage of clergy, iii. 62 (*see* Clergy). Of investiture, 138, 284. Transubstantiation, 183. Predestination, 349. Infant baptism, iv. 175. Absolute poverty, v. 438. Franciscan, 440. On Papal power, 442. Of beatific vision, 485. Of the cup to laity, vi. 200. Immaculate conception, 416.

Conventional art, vi. 610.

Convents. *See* Monasteries.

Conversion of Germans within the Empire, i. 257. Of Burgundians, 273. Of Franks, 274. Of Teutons, its effect, 282. Of Moravians, ii. 425. Of Hungary, iii. 29.

Convocation, vi. 116. At Oxford, 130.

Corbey, abbey of, ii. 435.

Corvara, Peter de. *See* Nicolas V.

Cornelius, Pope, i. 49. His confession, 50. His exile and death, 51.

Correggio, Gherardo, Papalist Lord of Parma, iv. 446.

Cosmical theories, vi. 431.

Council, General, Philip the Fair's appeal to, v. 255. Proposals for, vi. 17. Assumption of power by, 73.

Councils, General, discreditable character of, i. 151. The causes of this, 158, 159.

Councils, Œcumenic, of Nicea, i. 36. Carthage, 123. Ephesus, 157. Chalcedon, 169. Second Chalcedon, 207. Constantinople, ii. 137. Second Nicea, 184. Lyons, v. 91. Constance, vi. 155. Basle, 251.

Councils, Œcumenic, disputed, Constantinople, i. 340. Third Constantinople, ii. 170.

Courtenay, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, vi. 126. Condemns Wycliffe's tenets, 128.

Courtesy, source of in Crusades, iii. 256.

Courtrai, battle of, v. 241.

Courts of justice, English, supersede baronial and ecclesiastical courts, v. 174.

Crecy, battle of, v. 507.

Crescentius, Consul, ii. 476. His rebellion, 479. Appoints Philagathus Pope, 480. His ambition—Beheaded by Otho III., 481.

Crimes made capital by Christianity, i. 375. Commuted for money, 395.

Crimes of clergy, iii. 459.

Crucifix, vi. 608.

Crucifixion abolished by Constantine, i. 375.

Crusade, First, iii. 234. Preached by S. Bernard, 399. Disasters of, 401. Of Barbarossa, 545. Preached by Fulk of Neuilly, iv. 129. Of Cery, 132. Against heretics in south of France, 201, 203. Advance of, 209. Cruelties of, 210. Its successful progress, 215. Of Louis VIII. of France, 236. Urged by Pope Honorius III., 286. Delays, and indifference to, 297. Against Emperor Frederick II., 438. Of St. Louis, v. 9. In Cyprus and at Damietta, 11. Its disastrous end, 12. Against Manfred of Sicily, 26. Against Sicily, 114. Against the Colonnas, 165. Against Pagans in Prussia, 404. Against Dolcinites, 431. Against Moors, projected by Philip de Valois, 482. Of Pope against Pope, vi. 132. Against Hussites, 249.

Crusades, iii. 222. Earlier schemes of, 228. Determined at Clermont, 233. Their causes and results, 235, 236. The heroic age of Christianity, 237. Incidents of, 238. Cruelties during, 239. Estrange Eastern Empire, 240. Increase Papal power, 241. Increase wealth of Clergy, 245. At first defensive, 248. Afterwards aggressive, 249. Against heretics—against the Pope's enemies, 250. In America, 251. The source of chivalry, 251. Blend war and religion, 255. Their effect in Germany, 262. A resource of Papal policy, iv. 6. Their failure, 122; v. 55. Taxation of clergy for, iv. 126. Indifference to, 128, 162. Papal emoluments from, 311. Expire with Gregory X., v. 93. Close of, 128. Change in character of, 288. Races united by, vi. 534. Effects of on architecture, 586.

Crusaders, their want of funds for equipment, iii. 246. In Germany, 263. Their dissensions, iv. 123. At Venice, 135. At Zara, 140. Their treaty with Alexius, 142. Their embassy to Innocent III., 143. Sail for Constantinople, 144. Take Constantinople, 145. Their excesses, 148.

Crusading vows, princes fettered by, iii. 244.

Cup, administration of to laity, vi. 200.

Cupolas, vi. 572.

Customs of Clarendon. *See* Clarendon.

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the parent of Latin Christianity, i. 47. His contest with Novatus, 48. With Novatian, 50. On the unity of the Church—admits the Roman Bishop's superiority, 52. His contest with Pope Stephen, 53. His martyrdom, 54.

Cyprus, Frederick II. in, iv. 333. St. Louis at, v. 11.

Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, opposes Nestorius, i. 144. His character — persecutes Novatians, 145. The Jews, 146. Ferocity of his partisans, 148. His jealousy of Constantinople, 149. His epistles, 150. His violence rebuked by Theodosius, 156. At Ephesus, 162. Returns to Alexandria, 171. His contest with Syrian bishops, 173, and treaty of peace, 174.

Cyril (or Constantine), missionary to Bulgaria, ii. 420. To Moravia, 425. Recognised in Rome—his Moravian version of Scriptures, 427.

D.

Dæmonology, vi. 406.

Dalmatius opposes Nestorius, i. 168.

Damascus, fall of, ii. 40.

Damasus I., Pope, i. 67. Tumults at his election, 68. His violence, 69.

Damasus II., Pope, iii. 5.

Damiani, Peter, iii. 9, 35. Made Cardinal, 45. His mission to Milan, 65. Condemns clerical marriages, 66. At Council of Osbor, 75. Contrasted with Hildebrand, 103.

Damietta, taken by Crusaders, iv. 286. Retaken, 295. Occupied by St. Louis, v. 11. Siege of—capitulates to Saracens, 14.

Dandolo, Doge of Venice, iv. 134. His dealings with Crusaders, 136. Takes the Cross, 137. At Zara, 140. At Constantinople, 150.

Danegelt, iii. 458.

Danes in England, ii. 441.

Daniel the hermit, i. 229. Resists Basiliscus, and overthrows his empire, 231.

Dante on abdication of Cœlestine V., v. 140. 'De Monarchiâ,' 391. Doctrines of, 393. His lines on Dolcino, 432. His Hell, vi. 427. Creator of Italian literature, 510. Compared with Tacitus, 514. The religious poet—his Ghibellinism, 515.

Death, state after, ideas of, i. 473.

De Bosham, Becket's reader, iii. 472, 476. His advice, 499.

Decamerone, vi. 517. The example of pure Italian, 518.

Decius, persecution by, i. 47. Puts to death Pope Fabianus, 48.

De Clare, house of, quarrel with Becket, iii. 458, 462.

Decretal, the first, condemns marriage of clergy, i. 76.

Decretals, False, ii. 373. Their character, 374. Authorship of unknown, 375. The period of their appearance, 377. Accepted by clergy, 378, and adopted by Pope Nicolas I., 379. Were a step to Infallibility, 380. Collected by Gregory IX., iv. 371.

'*Defence* of Poverty,' vi. 471.

De Gray, named Archbishop of Canterbury, iv. 83. His appointment set aside by Innocent III., 87.

'*Deliberation*' of Pope Innocent III., iv. 41.

Delinquencies of clergy, i. 405. Ecclesiastical punishments for, 406.

Demagogues, Roman, vi. 343.

Demetrius the Despot, vi. 292. His rebellion, 294.

Denmark, Christianity in, ii. 434. Relations of with Innocent III., iv. 120.

Denys, St., said to be Dionysius the Areopagite, iii. 353, 366. Abbey of, 405. Patron of France, vi. 419.

Deo Gratias, Bishop of Carthage, i. 180. Relieves Roman captives, 220.

Desiderius, King of Lombardy, ii. 246. Takes part in Roman factions, 253. His alliance with Charlemagne, 254. Protects the children of Carloman, 258. Attacks the Papal territory, 259. Dethroned, 262.

Devils, belief in their agency, i. 469. Identified with Pagan gods, vi. 407. Ideas of, 409.

Deusdedit, Pope, ii. 122.

Dialectic exercises, iii. 354.

Dialectics, vi. 443.

Diephold, Count of Acerra, iv. 18. Defeated by Papalists under Walter of Brienne, 27. Takes Walter prisoner, 28. His preeminence in Naples, 29. Swears allegiance to Otho IV., 55.

'*Dies* Iræ,' vi. 491.

Diet at Frankfort, v. 457. At Ratisbon, 459. At Spires, 462. At Frankfort, vi. 328.

Diets in Germany, v. 494.

Dijon, Council of, iv. 127.

Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 54.
Dionysius, Pope, a Greek, i. 54.
Dionysius the Areopagite, translated by Scotus (Erigena), iii. 353. Supposed St. Denys, 366. Writings in name of, vi. 402.
Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, presides over Synod of Ephesus, i. 203. His violence to Flavianus, 205. Condemned and degraded by Council of Chalcedon, 209. Dies in exile, 227.
Diospolis (Lydda), Council of, i. 111.
Dispensations from Crusades, sale of, iv. 399; vi. 225, 227.
Dispensing power of Popes, v. 126.
Ditheism, origin and meaning of term, i. 43.
Divinity of Christ, i. 40. Contests about, 41.
Divorce, repugnant to early Roman manners, i. 366. Its later prevalence, 367. Its effect on Roman society — restrained by Christianity—regulated by Constantine, and by Theodosius II., 368. By Justinian—his laws on, afterwards repealed, 369.
Dolcinites, in the Val Sesia, v. 429. Attacked, 430. Their brave defence, 431. Distress for food, 432. Extermination of, 433.
Dolcino of Novara, v. 424. His doctrines, 427. Antipapalism, 428. Lines of Dante on, 432. His death by torture, 433.
Dominic, St., iv. 196, 247. His birth and education, 250. Rebukes Papal Legates in Languedoc, 251. Miracles of, 252. In Albigensian war, 253. His Order and Preachers, 254. At Rome—his increasing influence, 256. Enjoins vow of poverty, 257. His death, 258, and canonization, 259.
Dominicans, iv. 248. Their rapid progress—assemblies of, 257. Their extravagant belief, 259. Disputes with University of Paris, v. 44, 48, 51. Controversy with Franciscans, 440. In Germany, 458. Artists, vi. 615.
Domitian, persecution by, i. 26.
Donatello, vi. 602.
Donation of Constantine, a forgery, i. 57. Of Charlemagne, ii. 261.
Donatist schism, its effects in Africa, i. 185.
Donus, Pope, ii. 136.
Doomsday Book, vi. 369.
Dorchester (near Oxford), see of, ii. 68.
Dragon as an emblem, vi 410.
Drogo, Bishop of Metz, ii. 342.
Duns Scotus (*Erigena*), his philosophy, iii. 22. His definition of the Real Presence, 23. From Ireland or Scotch isles, 350. Refutes Predestinarians, 351. His rationalism—flies to England, 352. His translation of Dionysius the Areopagite, 353; vi. 402. His Pantheism, 436. One of the great schoolmen, 450. Obscurity of origin, 466. His logic, 467. His Latinity, 467. His opinions about Matter, 468.
Dunstan, iii. 114. His cruelty, 115. Contest with secular clergy, 116.

E.

East, state of (A.D. 500), i. 307. Disputes in, 340. State of (7th century), ii. 4.
Eastanfield, Synod of, ii. 88.
Easter, controversy about, i. 35. Settled at Council of Nicea, 36. Question of, in England, ii. 71.
Eastern Church mixed with court intrigues—its questions on the nature of the Godhead, i. 138. Becomes Trinitarian and adopts Nicean creed, 139. Its continued distractions, 226.
Eastern Churches, feuds of, i. 85. Buildings, vi. 573.
Eastern Empire. *See* Empire.
Eastern prelates, anti-Nestorian, i. 200.
Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, ii. 334.
Ebroin, Mayor of the Palace, his fall—forced to become a monk, ii. 222. Returns to the world—slays Bishop Leodegar, 223. Assassinated, 225.
Eccelin da Romano, iv. 375.
Eccelin da Romano (son of the above), iv. 375. Accused of heresy, 457. His cruelty, v. 33, and death, 34.
Ecclesiastical jurisprudence, i. 398. Its growth, 399.
Ecclesiastics. *See* Clergy.
Eckhart, vi. 554.
Ecthesis of Heraclius, ii. 126. Violent opposition to, 129.
Edmund of England titular king of Sicily, v. 25.
Education of clergy, vi. 358.
Edward the Confessor, iii. 118.
Edward I. of England, his power, v. 121, 125. Compared with Philip the Fair, 176. His return from crusade and designs, 177. His measures approved by clergy, 178. Deluded by Philip the Fair—declares war, 179. Rejects injunctions of Boniface VIII., 181. Borrows Church treasures, 185. Enforces subsidy, 186. Compels clergy to yield, 191. Seizes archbishop's estates—relents, 192. Confirms charters, 193. His league against France, 202. His ill success—accepts papal arbitration, 203. His treaty with Philip, 204. His statement of claims on Scotland, 218. Valuation of church property under, vi. 370.
Edward II., hesitates to arrest Templars, v. 307. His weakness, vi. 96.
Edward III., his meeting with Louis of Bavaria, v. 495. Gains battle of Crecy, 507. His compact with Gregory XI., vi. 112. His last years, 114. His death, 117.
Edward, Black Prince, approaches Avignon, v. 548. Popular love of, vi. 113. Dies, 116.
Edwin, King of Northumberland, ii. 62. His conversion and early adventures, 63. His power, 65. Defeat of and death, 66.
Edwy, King, cruel treatment of, iii. 114.
Egfrid, King of Northumbria, ii. 82.
Eginhard, his Life of Charlemagne, ii. 307.
Egypt, Mohammedan conquest of, ii. 43.
Egyptian monks, their ferocity. *See* Cyril, Dioscorus.

Eleanor, Queen, her letters to Cœlestine III., iii. 548.
Elections, Papal. *See* Papal Elections.
Electors, German, v. 549. Their ambassadors to Rome, vi. 326.
Elgiva, treatment of by Dunstan, iii. 115.
Elias, Brother, first general of Franciscans, iv. 274.
Eloquence, power of, iv. 245.
Elster, The, battle of, iii. 189.
Emeric, King of Hungary, iv. 120.
Emperors, Church supremacy of, i. 354. Election of, ii. 448. Weakened by Crusades, iv. 6. Two, coronation of, 35.
Empire, Eastern or Greek, exhaustion of, i. 427. Estranged from the West, iii. 240.
Empire, German, Teutonic, or Western, origin of, ii. 270. Vague authority of, 273. Of Charlemagne, threatened division of, 310. Weakness of under Louis, 324. Division into two parties, 328. Relations of to papacy, iii. 123. Its powers, 125, and weaknesses, 126. Vacancy of, iv. 30. Last strife of with papacy, 312. State of (time of Urban IV.), v. 54. (Time of Boniface VIII.), 167. Dissension in, 448. Protest of against John XXII., 457. Elections to, settled by Golden Bull, 549.
Empire, Latin, extinction of, i. 225.
Empire, Latin or Frankish of Constantinople, oppressiveness of, iv. 145.
England, state of (10th century), ii. 445. Married clergy in, iii. 114. Prosperity of under Becket, 449. War with France, 500. Affairs of (time of Urban IV.), v. 58. Barons of, denounced by Clement IV., 68. Subjection of, 70. Under Interdict, 86. Surrendered by John to Pope, 95. Dominicans in, 257. Innocent III.'s policy in, 279. Subjection of to Rome under Henry III., 307. Italian churchmen in, 308. Resists Italian churchmen, 310. Prepares for crusade, 323. Antipapal feelings in, 398, 426; vi. 33. Contributions from to Popes, iv. 444, 454. Reluctant to engage in Sicilian affairs, v. 25. Canon law in—married clergy in, 72. Constitution of (time of Boniface VIII.), 173. War with France, 179. Arrest of Templars in, 307, 341. Religious liberty in, 558. Wycliffites in, vi. 34. Teutonic, 94. Insurrection of peasants in, 125. Concordat with, 229. Journey of Æneas Sylvius through, 310. Independent of Pope, 391. Civil wars in, 393. Chronicles of, 506.
English Church, independence of, iii. 397. State of (time of Henry II.), 441. Privileges of, 442. Its wealth, vi. 368, 369. Its property, proposed confiscation and estimated amount of, 370. Alliance of with Lancastrian kings, 392.
English clergy of noble birth, vi. 392.
English language, vi. 507. Religious terms in, 534. Development of, 535. Teutonism of, 545.
English missionaries, ii. 109, 117.
English Schoolmen, vi. 450.
English wars in France, v. 548; vi. 97.
Enham, Council at, iii. 116.
Enzio, natural son of Frederick II., iv. 320. Vicar-general of North Italy, 409.

Marries heiress of Sardinia, 410. Defeats the Mongols, 417. His imprisonment, 448.
Ephesus, Council of, i. 157. Termination of, 172. 'Robber Synod' of, 203. Absolves Eutyches, 204. Confirmed by Theodosius II., 206. Reversed at Council of Chalcedon, 208.
Equality of mankind, vi. 383.
Erasmus, vi. 624.
Ethelbert, King of Kent, his reception of Augustine, ii. 57. His death, 61.
Etruscan diviners, their incantations against Alaric, i. 98.
Eucharist, undefined belief regarding, iii. 20. Wycliffe's opinions on, vi. 131.
Eudo de Stella, iv. 180.
Eudoxia, Empress, calls in Genseric, i. 217.
'*Everlasting* Gospel' of the Franciscans, v. 47, 417. Condemned by Alexander IV., 418.
Evesham, battle of, v. 69.
Eugenius I., Pope, ii. 134.
Eugenius III., Pope (a Cistercian), iii. 394. Recovers Rome, 395. Retires into France, 396. His relations with Roman republic, 407, and death, 408.
Eugenius IV., his election and character, vi. 242. Seizes treasures of Martin V., 243. Commands dissolution of Council of Basle, 252, 257. Is forced to yield, 259. Driven from Rome, 261. His hostility to Council, 262. Negotiates with Greek Emperor, 267. Proposes to remove Council to Italy, 268. His fleet at Constantinople, 273. His reception of Greek Emperor and Patriarch, 277. At Florence, 281. Signs treaty with Byzantines, 290, 291. His fame, 295. Interview with Æneas Sylvius, 324. Ratifies treaty with Germany—dies, 331.
Eulalius, disputed election of for Papacy, i. 135. Expelled, 136.
Euphemius, Bishop of Constantinople—contest of with Emperor Anastasius, i. 239.
Evreux, Bishopric of, iii. 312.
Europe, its only union Christianity, ii. 53. State of (10th century), 444. (At accession of Innocent III.), iv. 12. (Time of Urban V.), v. 555. Divided between rival Popes, vi. 15. State of communications in, 588.
Eusebius, Bishop of Doryleum, accuses Eutyches, i. 200.
Eutyches, a partisan of Cyril, i. 199. Leader of monks—his ignorance—excommunicated, 200. Supported by Eunuch Chrysaphius, 201. Appeals to Christendom, 202. His letter to Leo I., 203. Absolved by Synod of Ephesus, 204. Removed from Constantinople, 207.
Eutychianism, repressed by Emperor Leo, i. 230. Revives under Basiliscus, 231.
Eutychius, last exarch of Ravenna, his flight, ii. 214.
Exarchate of Ravenna, feebleness of, ii. 204.
Excommunication, force of, i. 155; iii. 126; vi. 361. Its frequent use, iii. 127. Letters of, secretly introduced by Becket, 516. Obsolete, vi. 631.
Expectatives, vi. 226.

F.

Fabianus, Pope, the first certain papal martyr, i. 48.
Fathers of Latin Christianity, i. 221.
Felix III., Pope, i. 236. His strife with Acacius, 237, 238. His legates at Constantinople, 237.
Felix IV., Pope, his election, i. 326. Death, 333.
Felix, Antipope, i. 64. His expulsion, 66.
Felix V. (Amadeus of Savoy), Antipope, vi. 301. His coronation, 317. Abdication, 334.
Ferrand, count of Flanders, iv. 97. Prisoner to Philip Augustus, 102.
Ferrara, meeting of Pope and Greek Emperor at, vi. 277. Plague at, 279.
Festivals of Saints, vi. 421.
Feudal system established by Charlemagne, ii. 278.
Feudal nobility, rapid decay of, ii. 360.
Field of Lies, ii. 331.
Firmilian, his letter against Pope Stephen, i. 53.
Fitz-Stephen, partisan of Becket, iii. 472.
Fitz-Urse, Reginald, iii. 519.
Flagellants, v. 35. Outburst of, 36.
Flanders, insurrection in, v. 241. Crusade in, vi. 133.
Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 200. Involved in court intrigues, 201. Treatment of at synod of Ephesus—his death, 205.
Flavianus, Bishop of Antioch, i. 242. Deposed, 245.
Flemish art, vi. 618.
Florence, ordeal at, iii. 91. Anti-Imperialist, v. 389, 390. Gregory XI.'s negotiations with, 567. Urban VI.'s treaty with, vi. 12. Lengued with Louis of Anjou, 79. Council removed to, 281. Prelates at, 285. Acts of Council at, 292. Dominican Convent in, 616.
Florentius, his plots against St. Benedict, i. 419.
Flotte, Peter, Chancellor of Philip the Fair, v. 226. Ambassador at Rome, 229. Denounced by Boniface VIII., 240. Killed at Courtrai, 242.
Foliot, Gilbert, antagonist of Becket, iii. 454. His character — Bishop of London, 455. At Northampton, 472. At Sens, 479. His reply to Becket, 490. Excommunicated by Becket—appeals, 501. Aspires to Primacy, 502. Receives Papal letters, 516. Preaches at Canterbury, 525.
Fontaines, abbey of, founded, ii. 103.
Forcheim, Diet of, iii. 177. Elects Rudolf of Suabia, 178.
Formosus, Bishop of Porto, anathematised by Pope John VIII., ii. 401. Absolved by Marinus, 407. Becomes Pope, 411. Crowns Arnulf emperor, 413. His death, 414. His mission to Bulgaria, 418.
Fortunatus, rival of Cyprian, i. 50.
Founders of Latin Christianity, i. 221.
Four parties in the East, i. 240.
Fra Angelico, vi. 616. Character of his paintings, 617.

Fra Angelo, v. 536.
France, Benedictine convents in, i. 425. Ravaged by Northmen, ii. 432. State of (10th century), 445. Married clergy in, iii. 112. (With Spain) the birth-place of chivalry, 252. War of, with England, 500. Extension of, under Philip Augustus, iv. 62. Under Interdict, 67. Heresies in South of, 179. Manicheism in, 181. Legates of Innocent III. in, 195. State of (time of Boniface VIII.), v. 175. War with England, 179. Insurgent peasantry in, v. 444. Oppressed by French Popes, vi. 31. English wars in, 97. Concordat with, 229. Wealth of church in, 368. Church in, 389. Its secession from German empire, 510, 520.
Francis, St., iv. 248. His birth and youth, 261. Embraces mendicancy, 263. Instances of his enthusiasm, 264. Appears before Innocent III.—founds Franciscan order, 265. Institutes foreign missions, 266. In the East —preaches before Saracen Sultan, 267. His gentle character, 268. His poetry, 269. His sermon on the Nativity, 270. His 'stigmata,' 271. His death, 272. Superstitious worship of, 273. Rule of, 275.
Franciscan Order, its foundation and principles, iv. 265. Martyrs, 267. Tertiaries, 271. Schoolmen, vi. 464. Artists, 615.
Franciscanism, character of, iv. 272.
Franciscans begin to repudiate poverty, iv. 274. Their growing wealth condemned by Matthew Paris, 276. Schism among, v. 48, 415. Hostility of to Boniface VIII, 212. Its causes, 213, 415. Spiritual, 416. Chapter of at Perugia, 439. Become Ghibelline, 441. In Rome, receive Louis of Bavaria, 470. Favoured by Alexander V., vi. 75. Resisted in France, 78.
Franciscans, vi. 464.
Franconian Emperors, iii. 323.
Frangipani, Cencius, seizes Pope Gelasius II., iii. 305.
Frangipani, family of, iii. 305, 324; iv. 459. Adherents of Frederick II., 330. Support Alexander III., 532. Intermarry with Eastern Emperor, 534.
Frankfort, Council of, ii. 299. Condemns Adoptians and image-worship, 300. Canons of, 304. Its independence of Rome, 305.
Frankfort, Diets at, iv. 290; v. 457; vi. 328.
Frankish Church becomes Teutonised, ii. 220. Its wealth and corruption, 225, 237.
Frankish kings supreme over Church, i. 381, 382.
Franks, Catholics, i. 274. Converted by Latin clergy, 280.
Franks (crusading), their contempt for Greeks, iii. 241.
Fraticelli blended with Cœlestinians, v. 214. Strife with wealthy Franciscans, 416. Denounce worldliness of Popes, 436. Spread of their doctrines, 437.
Fravitta, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 239.
Frederick Barbarossa, negotiates with Henry II., iii. 483. Pestilence in his army, 494, 533. Takes Rome, 532. Retreats, 533. Defeated at Legnano, 535. His meeting with the Pope, 537. His treaty with Lombards at

Constance, 530. Marries his son to Constantia of Sicily, 541. His crusade—drowned in Pisidia, 545.

Frederick II., his birth, iii. 552. King of Romans, 553. Made ward of Pope Innocent III., iv. 22. His education, 29. His claim to empire set aside by Innocent III., 42. Joins insurgents against Otho IV., 58. Obtains empire, 61. Innocent III.'s guardianship of, 278. Takes the Cross, 287, 288. Correspondence with Honorius III., 289. His son Henry elected his successor, 290. His letter to the Pope, 291. His coronation—his laws in favour of ecclesiastics, 293. Against heretics, 294. In Sicily, 295. His engagement to proceed to Palestine, 297. Marries Iolante, 298. Correspondence with Honorius III., 301. His character and views, 313. Admonished by Gregory IX., 317. His court, 318. His poetry, 319. Negotiates with Sultan of Egypt, 322. Prepares for Crusade, 323. Sets out and returns—excommunicated, 324. His appeal to sovereigns, 328. His allies in Rome, 329. Arrives in the East, 333. Opposed by religious orders of Knights, 335. Occupies Joppa, 336. Sends embassy to Sultan Kameel, 338. Makes treaty, 340. Visits Jerusalem, 341. His coronation and address, 342. His compliances with Mohammedanism, 343. His letter to Henry III. of England, 346. At Ptolemaïs, 349. Returns to Italy, 352. His successes against Pope, 353. General feeling in favour of, 354. Makes treaty with Pope, 356. Legislates for kingdom of Naples, 358. Asserts supremacy of law, 360. Condemns heretics, 361. His laws about clergy, 362, cities, and peasants, 363. Appoints Parliaments, his criminal laws, 364. Other laws, 365. Commercial measures, 366. Encourages learning, 367. His taste and magnificence, 368. His evil fame among the clergy, 370. Periods in his life, 371. Assists Pope against Romans, 379. Represses his son Henry's rebellion, 380. Declares war against Lombards, 381. His correspondence with Gregory IX., 382. Gains victory of Corte Nuova, 383. Excommunicated by Pope, 386. His reply, 387. His appeal to the cardinals—to the Romans, 389. To the princes of Christendom, 390. To the commonalty, 392. Pope's reply to, 394. Reported sayings of, 396. His rejoinder to Pope, 397. His proclamation to German princes, 404. War with Pope, 409. Threatens Rome, 411. His circular letters, 413, 416. His naval victory and capture of Prelates, 414. Offers peace to Innocent IV., 419. Loses Viterbo, 420. Negotiates with Pope, 421. Complains of Pope's flight, 424. Refuses to appear at Lyons, 432. Declared deposed, 433. His appeal to Christendom, 435. Conspiracy against, 438. His charge against Innocent IV., 434. Asserts his orthodoxy, 440. His successes in Italy, 441. At Turin, 445. Loses Parma—turning-point in his fortunes, 446. His defeat, 447. Other disasters, 448. His death, 450. His character, 451. His religion, 452. Fidelity of his friends, 454. Compared with St. Louis, v. 16.

Frederick III., Emperor, vi. 318. Reconciled to Eugenius IV., 326. His claims on Milan, 335. His marriage and coronation at Rome, 343. Made Viceroy of Sicily, v. 127.

Frederick of Lorraine. *See* Stephen IX.

Frederick of Arragon, offers of Boniface VIII. to, v. 156. Crowned at Palermo, 157. His war with Charles of Naples — successful resistance to Charles of Valois, 159. Defence of Sicily, 159. Excluded from Jubilee, 210. Acknowledged King of Sicily, 244.

Frederick of Austria candidate for Empire, v. 448. Taken prisoner, 452. His treaty with Louis of Bayaria, 460. His death, 480.

Frederick of Austria, vi. 159. Assists flight of John XXIII., 188. Humiliation of, 195.

Free Companies in Italy, v. 563.

Freemasons, guild of, vi. 587. Theory of, unfounded, 588.

Free will, the main controversy of Latin Christianity, i. 7. *See* Pelagianism.

French in Sicily, their oppressiveness, v. 105. Massacre of, 112.

French chronicles, vi. 506.

French clergy, English partisans among, vi. 389.

French invasion of Naples, v. 64, 67.

French language, Roman origin of, vi. 519.

French lawyers, v. 175.

French nobles take the Cross, iv. 132. Their embassy to Venice, 134. Their embarrassment, 135. At Zara, 140. Condemn conduct of Gregory IX., 402. Address to cardinals, v. 236.

French prelates resist Roman supremacy, ii. 491, 493. Their prowess in attack of Constantinople, iv. 147. Their jealousy of the Venetians, 158. Summoned to Rome, v. 230, 242. Address Boniface VIII., 237. Assent to General Council, 256. Adhere to Philip the Fair, 257. Support Philip against Templars, 306.

French schoolmen, vi. 450.

French writers biassed against the Templars, v. 355.

Fretteville, treaty of, iii. 512.

Friar, Franciscan, accused of poisoning Benedict XI., v. 273.

Friar, Mendicant, anecdote of, v. 114.

Friars, Preaching, iv. 248. Their firm adherence to Popedom, 405. Their activity and preaching, 406. Contest with hierarchy, v. 41. Aim at ruling the Universities, 42. Subjected to episcopal authority by Innocent IV., 45. Generals of orders, 48. Unpopular at Paris, 50. Their great theologians, 51. Their dispute with seculars, 52. Their devotion in the plague, 545. Defended by Clement VI., 546. Their proportion to Monks, vi. 362. Inducements to become, 363. Corruption of, 386.

'*Friends* of God,' vi. 555, 561.

Friesland, Bishop Wilfrid in, ii. 84. St. Boniface in, 111.

Fulbert, uncle of Heloisa, iii. 362, 364.

Fulda, monastery of, ii. 115.

Fulk of Marseilles, a Troubadour, Bishop

of Toulouse, iv. 197. His hostility to Count Raymond, 220. At Lateran Council, 230. His treacherous advice to citizens of Toulouse, 234. Persecutes heretics, v. 16.

Fulk of Neuilly, iv. 128. Preaches the Crusade, 129, 130. Effects of his preaching transient—his death, 131.

Fussola, see of, created by St. Augustine, i. 186. Dispute with Rome about its suppression, 187.

G.

Gabriano, iv. 16.

Gaeta, Gregory XII. at, vi. 86.

Galeria, Count of, iii. 53.

Gall, St., ii. 107. Founds monastery at Arbon, 108.

Gall, St., monastery of, burnt by Hungarians, ii. 445.

Gallican Church, rights of, v. 234; vi. 174, 282.

Gallus, Emperor, banishes Pope Cornelius, i. 51.

Gaul, the first Christians in, were Greek, i. 29. Church in, 190. Its disputes, 191. Appeals to Rome from, 192. Religious wars in, 278. Monasticism in, 413. Fall of Arianism in, 446.

Gaunt, John of, vi. 108. Popular suspicion of, 114. Regent, 116. Supports Wycliffe, 118. Decline of his power, 119.

Gebhard of Eichstadt. *See* Victor II.

Geismar, sacred oak of, felled by S. Boniface, ii. 112.

Gelasius I., Pope, i. 251. His letter to Emperor Anastasius, 252.

Gelasius II., Pope, seized by the Frangipanis, iii. 305. His flight to Gaeta—excommunicates Burdinus, 306. Returns to Rome under Norman protection, 307. Dies at Clugny, 308.

Genoa, Henry of Luxemburg at, v. 389.

Genoese side with Pope Gregory IX.—their fleet defeated, iv. 414.

Genseric, his conquest of Africa, i. 189. His Arianism and cruelty, 190. Conquers Sicily—invited to attack Rome by Eudoxia, 217. Sacks Rome, 219.

Gerard, St., at Toul, iii. 28.

Gerbert, his birth and early life, ii. 486. Adheres to Hugh Capet, 489. Archbishop of Rheims, 492. Accused by Papal legate, 493. Placed under Interdict, 494. Retires to court of Otho III., 495. Made Pope, 496. His death, 498. Suspected of necromancy, 499.

Gerhard, Archbishop of Mentz, v. 169.

German art, vi. 618.

German Bishoprics founded, ii. 114.

German chiefs in Italy, iv. 18.

German Church, its dependence on Rome, ii. 236.

German cities, antipapalism in, vi. 551.

German clergy (married), resist Gregory VII., iii. 136, 140.

German Empire. *See* Empire.

German monasteries, ii. 115.

German poets, vi. 532.

German preaching, vi. 553.

German prelates, their pilgrimage to Jerusalem, iii. 81. Resist Papal embassy, 134. Renounce allegiance to Gregory VII., 150. Maintain supremacy of Empire, 419. Take part against Innocent III., iv. 48. Divided between Philip and Otho, 49. Remonstrate with Gregory IX., 402. Indignant against Papacy, 404. At Constance, vi. 175.

German Schoolmen, vi. 449.

'*German* Theology,' vi. 562.

German versions of Scriptures, vi. 532.

German wars fomented by Innocent III., iv. 279.

Germans. *See* Teutons.

Germano, San, treaty of, iv. 297, 356.

Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople, resists Iconoclasm, ii. 158. His degradation and death, 163.

Germany, missionaries in, ii. 111. Conversion of, belonged to Latin Christianity, 118. Ravaged by Northmen, 432. State of (10th century), 446. Married clergy in, iii. 136. Civil war in, 178. Effect of crusades in, 262. Civil war in, 271. State of at accession of Innocent III., iv. 30. Civil war in, 36, 41. Ferocity of war in, 51. Renewed strife in, 59. Acquittal of Templars in, v. 353. Interdict in, 489. Indignant at Henry IV.'s humiliation, 504. Concordat with, vi. 229. State of (during Hussite war), 254. Indifferent to Papal schism, 304. Power of clergy in, 367. Church in, 390. Asserts its independence of Pope, 493. Rejects Papal authority, 494. Separation of from France, 520. Heretics in, 561.

Gerold, Patriarch of Jerusalem, his hostility to Frederick II., iv. 340. His letter to Pope, 346.

Gerson, chancellor of Paris—at Pisa, vi. 70. Opposes Friars, 78. Head of French deputies, 174. His arrival at Constance, 182. His maxims, 190. Joins in proceedings against Jerome of Prague, 214. His exile and death, 220.

Ghibellines, iv. 19, 381. Their hatred to Boniface VIII., v. 215. Great chiefs of, 449. Ascendancy of (time of Gregory XI.), 563.

Ghibellines and Guelfs, iii. 533; iv. 239; v. 32, 56, 129, 160, 449. In Milan, 387.

Ghiberti, vi. 602.

Gilbert de la Porée, iii. 397.

Gilbert, Prior, first Dominican preacher in England, iv. 257.

Gildas, St., monks of, their barbarism, iii. 368.

Giordano, Patrician of Rome, iii. 395.

Giotto, his works, vi. 612. Allegorical paintings, 613.

Glass introduced in England, ii. 80.

Godfathers, i. 365; ii. 98.

Godfrey of Lorraine, iii. 11. His penance, 12. Marries Beatrice of Tuscany, 40. Raises insurrection in Germany, 42. Marquis of Tuscany, 46. Arbitrates between rival Popes, 72. His letter to Hanno of Cologne, 74.

Godfrey of Boulogne, iii. 234. Refuses to be crowned, 239.

Golden Bull, iv. 121.

Golden Legend, vi. 491.

GOLDEN.

Golden Rose, vi. 185.
Goliards, vi. 502, 504.
Golias, on the Last Judgment, vi. 504.
'*Good* Estate,' laws of, v. 519.
Gothic architecture, vi. 584. Its rapid rise and extension, 585. Contemporaneous with Crusades, 586. National features in, 589. Italian, 590. Symbolism of, 592. Mysteries represented in, 593.
Gothic cathedrals, vi. 591.
Gothic, name of, vi. 589.
Goths request leave to settle in Eastern Empire, i. 270. Their partial conversion, 271. Their divisions—become Christian, 272. Arianism of, 300. Take Rome, 345.
Gotschalk, iii. 349. Persecution of, 350.
Græco-Arabic philosophy, vi. 448.
Gratian, Papal legate, iii. 502. Takes Becket's part, 504, 505.
Greek authors, translations of, vi. 351.
Greek books introduced through the Arabic, vi. 440.
Greek Christianity, speculative character of, i. 2. Not aggressive, 3. Decay of, 4. Remains a peculiar faith, 5. Compared with Latin, 5, 6.
Greek Christians in Italy, iv. 361.
Greek Church, its separation from the Latin, i. 58. Estranged by conquest of Constantinople, iv. 156. Toleration of, 160. Admits supremacy of Rome, v. 90. Ambassadors of, at Lyons, 92. Returns to independence, 97. Attempted reconciliation of, vi. 239, 266. Treaty, 290, 291. Treaty resisted in the East, 294.
Greek Empire. *See* Empire.
Greek fire, ii. 154, 157.
Greek language, its prevalence, i. 28. The language of speculative controversies, 32. Study of, vi. 447.
Greek learning, vi. 623.
Greek monasticism, i. 4.
Greek prelates, chimerical views of, vi. 271. Embark for Italy, 273. Their voyage, 274. At Ferrara—their discontent, 278. Jealousies among, 280. Removed to Florence, 281. Their discussions, 289. Sign treaty, 290, 291.
Greek Testament, vi. 624.
Greek theology, its subtlety of definitions of the Godhead, i. 5.
Greeks in South Italy, iii. 33.
Gregory I. (the Great), i. 429. The father of mediæval Papacy, 430. His birth and early sanctity, 431. Becomes abbot, 432. His severe discipline, 433. His design of converting Britain, 434. Sent to Constantinople, 434. His 'Magna Moralia,' 435. His return to Rome, 436. Is made Pope, 437. Retains his love of monkhood, 438. Settles the church services, 439. His preaching—improves church music, 440. His administration, 441. His almsgiving, 442. Enforces discipline in the Church, 444. Converts Spain to orthodoxy, 445. Opposes Donatism in Africa, 447. Sends Augustine to Britain, 448; ii. 57. His gentleness and forbearance to heathens, i. 448. Humanity to Jews, 449. Tries to check slave-trade, 450. Letters of, 451, 452. His temporal

GREGORY.

power, 452. State of Rome at his accession, 453. Defends Rome and obtains peace, 456. His influence with Theodelinda—effects conversion of Lombards, 458. Letter about monastics, 459. His adulation to Phocas, 460. Blinded by ecclesiastical zeal, 463. His death and epitaph, 464. His praise of celibacy, 468. His policy in Britain, ii. 59.
Gregory II., ii. 158. His letter to Emperor Leo, 159. Its strange arguments, 160. Its defiant language, 161. His second letter, 162. His love of images, 206. His peaceful labours, 207. His supposed danger of assassination, 208. His meeting with Liutprand, 210. Contributes to separate Rome from Empire, 211. His death, 212.
Gregory III., ii. 167. Sends embassy to Constantinople, 212. Condemns Iconoclasts, 213. An image-worshipper, 214. Appeals for aid to Charles Martel, 215. His offers to Charles, 218. His death, 227.
Gregory IV., adheres to sons of Louis the Pious, ii. 330. Visits the camp of Louis, 331.
Gregory VI., Pope by purchase, ii. 506. Deposed by Henry III., 508.
Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), iii. 6. Papal Legate at Tours, 26. Proposes Gebhard for Pope, 33. Elected Pope, 93. Confirmed by Henry IV., 95. His birth and youth, 100. At Clugny, 101. His influence, 102. His designs, 104. His decrees against simony and marriage of clergy, 118. His letter to Philip I. of France, 120. To William the Conqueror, 121. His claims of supremacy, 122, 123. His demands on Emperor Henry IV., 132, 134. Calls Synod on investitures, 137. His breach with Henry IV., 139. His harshness to married clergy, 141. Hatred against, 143. Seized by Cencius, 145. Rescued, 146. His letter to Henry IV., 147. His deposition declared, 152. His speech to Council, 153. Interdicts and deposes Henry IV., 154. His manifesto, 159. Letters to Germany, 160, 161. At Canósa, 167. Imposes terms, 170. Absolves Henry, 171. His embarrassment, 176. Charged with guilt of civil war, 178. His conduct in German wars, 180. Acquits Berengar of heresy, 183. Predicts Henry's death, 187. Is declared to be deposed, 188. His critical position and intrepidity, 191. Besieged in Rome, 192. Rejects terms of peace, 193. Obtains succours in money from Normans, 195. In St. Angelo, 196. Rescued by the Normans, 197. Retires from Rome, 198. His death, and character, 199. His system, 201. His schemes against Mohammedanism, 229.
Gregory VIII., iii. 543, 544.
Gregory IX. (Ugolino), iv. 312. His first act, 314. His letter to the Lombards, 316. Incensed at delay of Crusade, 324. His declaration against Frederick II., 325. Excommunicates Frederick, 330. Driven from Rome, 331. His inveteracy against Frederick, 332. Denounces treaty with Saracens, 347. His letter to Albert of Austria, 348. Invades Apulia, 350. Raises war against Frederick, 352. Disapproved by Christendom, 353. Returns to Rome, 354. His treaty

with Frederick, 356. Promulgates the Decretals, 372. His intrigues with Lombards, 377. His correspondence with Frederick, 382. Pronounces excommunication, 386. Reply to Frederick, 394. Exactions from English clergy, 399. Offers empire to Robert of France, 401. His war with Emperor, 409. His solemn procession at Rome, 411. Summons Council to Rome, 413. His death, 416. Places Inquisition under Friars, v. 18. Favours University of Paris, 43.

Gregory X., his election and views, v. 86, 87. His measures of pacification, 88. Approves election of Rodolph of Hapsburg, 89. Holds Council of Lyons, 91. Regulates Papal elections, 92. His death, 93.

Gregory XI., his compact with Edward III., vi. 112. Proceeds against Wycliffe, 120. Mediates between France and England, 562. His disasters, 563. His mercenary force in Italy, 564. His voyage to Italy, 565. His authority rejected, 566. His death, 567.

Gregory XII., vi. 55. His letter to rival Pope, 56. His doubtful conduct, 57. His excuses, 58, and delays, 59. In Venetian territory, 64. His Council, 67. Declared deposed at Pisa, 71. His retreat at Gaeta—flies to Rimini, 86. His deputies at Constance, 179.

Gregory, Antipope, ii. 501.

Grim, Edward, tries to defend Becket, iii. 522.

Grimoald, Duke of Benevento, ii. 265.

Grostête, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, iv. 468. His strictness, 469. Appears before Pope Innocent IV. at Lyons, 470. Resists command of Pope, 471. His death, and reputed sanctity, 472.

Groves, sacred, of Teutons, i. 261.

Gualberto, John, Abbot of Vallombrosa, iii. 90.

Gualo, Cardinal, Papal Legate in England, iv. 306.

Guelf, Duke of Bavaria, opposes Henry IV., iii. 212. His breach with Papal party, 218. Joins crusade, 264.

Guelf, of Bavaria, the younger, marries Matilda of Tuscany, iii. 211. Quarrels with her, 218. Obtains possession of Tuscany, 412.

Guelfs in Italy, iv. 19. Resist Henry of Luxemburg, v. 389.

Guelfs and Ghibellines, iii. 539; iv. 299; v. 32, 56, 129, 160, 449. In Milan, v. 387.

Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, iii. 145. His strife with Gregory VII., 151, 156. Antipope, 189. Consecrated at Rome, 196. Crowns Henry IV. Emperor, 196. Driven out by Victor III. and the Normans, 206. Maintains himself in Rome, 215. Condemned at Council of Piacenza, 217. Finally excluded from Rome, 219. His death, 261.

Guido, Duke of Spoleto, his attempt on Burgundy, ii. 409. His wars in Italy, 410. Flight and death, 412.

Guido, Archbishop of Milan, iii. 60. His timidity, 66. Strife with Ariald, 86. Resigns his see, 87. Dies, 88.

Guido di Montefeltro, his advice to Boniface VIII., v. 166.

Guido della Torre, in Milan, v. 386.

Guiscard, Robert, iii. 52. Attacks Greek Empire, 191. Sends succour to Pope Gregory VII., 195. Advances on Rome, 196. Fires the city, 197. His severity to Romans, 198.

Gundebald, Burgundian prince, slays his brothers, i. 275, 278. Saves his niece Clotilda, 275. Becomes tributary to Clovis, 278.

Gundicar, the Burgundian, i. 275.

Gunther, Archbishop of Cologne, ii. 364. Excommunicated by Nicolas I., 365. Retires to France, 366. Denounces the Pope, 367. Abandoned by Lothaire, 367. His humiliation and death, 383.

Gunther, of Schwartzenburg, elected Emperor—resigns—his death, v. 507.

Guy, Count of Flanders, v. 195. Abandoned by Edward I., 220. Imprisonment of, 226.

H.

Hadrian, I., ii. 256. Attacked by Desiderius—sends to Charlemagne, 259. Endowed by Charlemagne with territories, 261. Lord of the Exarchate, 263. His death, 265. His deference to Charlemagne, 303.

Hadrian II., condemns Photius, ii. 356. His reception of Lothair II., 382. Adheres to Louis II. against Charles the Bald, 384. His letter to Charles the Bald, 387. Abandons Carloman, 390. His death, 391.

Hadrian IV. (Nicolas Breakspear), iii. 408. His mission to Norway, grants Ireland to Henry II., 409. Places Rome under Interdict, 410. Puts to death Arnold of Brescia, 413. His fear of Frederick Barbarossa, 414. Crowns him, 416. Alliance with William of Sicily, 417. His Legates at Besançon, 418. Seeming reconciliation with Frederick, 420. His correspondence, 422, and demands, 423. His firmness, 424. His secret treaty with Lombard cities—his death, 425.

Hadrian V., v. 94.

Hakim, Sultan of Egypt, persecutes pilgrims, iii. 227.

Hallam, Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, at Constance, vi. 174. Supports Emperor, 185. Condemns punishment of death for heresy, 214. His death, 223.

Hamburg and Bremen, Archbishopric of, ii. 437.

Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 73. Carries off young Emperor Henry IV., 74. Becomes unpopular, 76. His strife with Adalbert of Bremen, 80. His power, 82. Insurrection against—his vengeance, 135.

Harding, Stephen, founder of Cistercian order, iii. 332.

Harold, Prince of Denmark, baptized at Ingelheim, ii. 434.

Hawkwood, Captain of Free Company, v. 563.

Hartzburg, stronghold of Henry IV., iii. 132. Burnt by Saxons, 133.

Heathenism extinct under Gregory I., i. 465.

Heaven, vi. 430. Dante's theory of, 431.

Hebrew Scriptures, vi. 624.

HEGIRA.

Hegira, ii. 19.
Heidelberg, Pope John XXIII. imprisoned at, vi. 197.
Heimburg, Gregory of, vi. 327.
Helena, Empress, ii. 179.
Heliand, The, vi. 532.
Hell, tales of visits to, i. 474. Ideas of, vi. 426. Dante's, 427.
Heloisa, iii. 362. Her devotion to Abélard, 363. Her marriage—takes the veil, 364. Prioress of Argenteuil—Abbess of the Paraclete—her letters, 369. Buries Abélard, 377.
Henoticon of Zeno, its temporary success, i. 232. Satisfies no party, 235.
Henry II., Emperor, ii. 500. His coronation, 502. Overruns Apulia and takes Capua, 503.
Henry III., Emperor, degrades the three Popes, ii. 508. His coronation and oath, iii. 4. His commanding character, 5. His war with Hungary, 30. His meeting with Leo IX., 31. Marches into Italy, 40. Recalled to Germany, 41. Death of, 42.
Henry IV., Emperor, his abduction by Archbishop Hanno, iii. 74. His resentment, 76. Favours Adalbert of Bremen, 77. His minority, 80. Confirms election of Gregory VII., 95. His character, 128. His marriage, 129. His war with the Saxons, 130. Takes refuge in Worms—regains his power, 131. His breach with Gregory VII., 139. Summoned to Rome, 148. Calls Diet at Worms, 149. Declares Pope's deposition, 150. Letter to clergy and people of Rome, 151. Deposed and interdicted by Pope, 155. Conspiracy against, 156. Deserted by prelates, 158. His desperation, 159. Retires to Spires, 164. In Burgundy, 165. At Canosa, 167. His degrading submission, 169, and conditional absolution, 170. Retires to Reggio, 173. Grows in power, 175. His craft, 177. Re-action in favour of, 179. Invades Swabia, 180. His successes over Rudolph—again excommunicated, 185. Renounces Gregory's authority, 188. Defeated at the Elster—marches into Italy, 190. Besieges Rome, 192. Proposes terms, 193. Wastes Tuscany, 194. Obtains possession of Rome—crowned by Antipope, 196. Retires before Normans, 197. Renews war with Matilda, 211. His difficulties in Germany, 212. His son Conrad's rebellion, 213. Disinherits Conrad, 262. Protects Jews, 264. Makes Henry his heir—his prosperity, 265. Proclaims peace of the Empire, 266. Fails to acknowledge Paschal—his excommunication renewed, 267. His son Henry rebells against him, 270. Deserted by his followers, 272. Deceived by his son—made prisoner, 273. His humiliation, 274. Popular feeling in his favour 274. Recovers strength, keeps Easter at Liege, 275. His death—treatment of his remains, 276.
Henry V., made heir to Empire, iii. 265. Rebells against his father, 270. His hypocrisy, 271, and treachery, 273. Imprisons his father, 274. Elected Emperor, 274. Besieges Cologne, 275. His treatment of his father's remains, 276. Invites Paschal II. into Germany, 279. Asserts right of investiture, 280. Holds Diet at Ratisbon, and collects his forces, 281. Enters Italy, and destroys Novara, 282. Advances on Rome, 283. His treaty with Pope—gives up investiture, 284. His procession to St. Peter's, 286. Hollowness of his compact, 287. Imprisons Pope, 289. Contest with Romans, 289. Treaty with Pope, 291. Crowned by Paschal II, 292. Returns to Germany, 293. Excommunicated by Council of Vienne, 295. Celebrates his father's funeral, 297. Enters Italy—takes possession of Tuscany, 302. Advances to Rome, 303. His meeting with Calixtus II., 313. His affairs in Germany, 317. Treaty with Saxons, 318. Concordat with the Pope, 319. His death, 323.
Henry VI., marries Constantia, heiress of Sicily—his ferocity, iii. 541. Anecdote of his coronation, 546. Destroys Tusculum—his war with Tancred, 547. Imprisons Richard Cœur de Lion, 548. Regains Apulia and Sicily, 550. Overruns Italy—his cruelties, 551. Excommunicated, 552. His power—dismantles Capua and Naples—his death, 553. Buried at Palermo, 554. His pretended will, iv. 27.
Henry, son of Frederick II., elected successor to his father, iv. 230. His father's vicegerent in Germany, 358. His rebellion, 380.
Henry I. of England, complaints against, at Council of Rheims, iii. 312. His interview with Calixtus II, 315. Acknowledges Innocent II., 338. Settles question of Investiture, 439.
Henry II. of England, his power and ability, iii. 442, 460. Accession of, 447. Makes Becket Chancellor, 448. His blind confidence in Becket, 452. Appoints him archbishop, 453. Is opposed by him, 457. Resists clerical immunities, 458. Jealous of clerical power, 461. Calls parliament at Westminster—resisted by Becket, 462. Summons council at Clarendon, 463. Establishes Constitutions, 464. Negotiates with Alexander III., 467. His measures on Becket's flight, 476. Sends embassy to Flanders and France, 477. Banishes Becket's dependents, 482. Makes overtures to Frederick Barbarossa, 483. Wavers between rival Popes, 484. Cited by Becket, 485. His wrath at Becket's measures, 488. Causes Becket's expulsion from Pontigny, 489. Assists Alexander III. with money, 492. Receives Papal legates, 496. Meets Becket at Montmirail, 499. His war with France, 500. His intrigues in Italy, 501. Interview with Papal legates, 503. Treaty broken off, 505. Renews negotiations, 507. His proclamation, 508. Obtains the coronation of his son, 509. His reconciliation with Becket, 512. Receives excommunicated bishops, 518. His fatal words, 519. His sorrow, 523. Reconciliation with Pope, 524. Penance at Canterbury, 525.
Henry III. of England, his education entrusted to Becket, iii. 452. Crowned by Archbishop of York, 510. His minority, iv. 305. Accepts Crown of Naples for his son, 458. His contributions to Pope, 459. Ap-

peal of St. Louis to, v. 14. His vanity, 25. His war with barons, 58. His imprisonment, 69, and victory, 70. Re-action against, 71.

Henry IV. of England, accession of, vi. 141. His dealings with parliament, 145. Church property under, 370.

Henry V., accession of, vi. 147. Insecurity of his throne, 151. Measures against Lollards, 152.

Henry, Count of Flanders, iii. 477.

Henry, Emperor of Constantinople, iv. 158.

Henry, youngest son of Emperor Frederick II., his death, iv. 461.

Henry I., King of France, impedes Council of Rheims, iii. 13.

Henry the Lion, subdued by Frederick Barbarossa, iii. 538.

Henry of Austria, v. 452.

Henry, Bishop of Winchester, iii. 441. His advice to Becket, 471.

Henry, Bishop of Liege, profligacy of, vi. 385.

Henry the Deacon, iv. 176. His preaching and proselytes, 177, 178. Resisted by St. Bernard, 179.

Henry of Castile, v. 75. Elected Senator of Rome—adheres to Conradin, 76.

Henry of Luxemburg crowned at Rome—his war with Naples, v. 390. His noble character and death. 391. Dante's hero, 392.

Henry of Thuringia, anti-Emperor, iv. 444. His death, 445.

Heraclius, Emperor in the East, ii. 32, 33. Involved in Monothelite controversy, 124. Publishes the Ecthesis, 126. His death, followed by revolutions, 127.

Heredipety denounced by Jerome, i. 71.

Hereditary clergy, danger of, iii. 109.

Heresy a new crime, i. 352. Under Justinian's law, 376. Under barbaric codes, 338. Statutes against, iv. 239. Increased severity against, 240. Is not extinguished, 241. Supported by preaching, 245; and by vernacular teaching, 246. Laws of Frederick II. against, 361.

Heretico de Comburendo, statute, vi. 143.

Heretics, re-baptism of, controversy about, i. 52. Laws against, 377. Crusades against, iv. 168. Three classes of, 175. Burning of, 180. Laws of Frederick II. against, 294. Persecuted, 375. Procedure against, v. 17. Persecution of in France, 20. Burned in Germany, vi. 561.

Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, crowns Conrad the Salic, iii. 56. His wars, 57. His contest with Conrad, 58. His death, 60.

Heribert, Archbishop of Ravenna, iii. 56.

Herlembald, his zeal against married clergy, iii. 84. His tyranny at Milan, 87.

Herluin, founder of Abbey of Bec, iii. 436.

Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 11.

Herman of Salza, Master of Teutonic Order, his fidelity to Frederick II., iv. 453. His high character, v. 403.

Hermenegild, Spanish prince, i. 446. His rebellion and death, 447.

Hermingard married to Charlemagne, ii. 256. Divorced, 257.

Hermingard, wife of Louis the Pious, ii. 319. Her death, 320.

Hertha (or Herthus), a Teutonic deity, i. 260.

Heruliane, i. 293.

Hexham, church at, ii. 81.

Hierarchy under Charlemagne, feudal, ii. 289. Strengthened by Charlemagne, 298.

Hierarchy of middle ages, benefits of, iii. 202.

Hierarchy, strength of, iv. 171. Its tyranny, 172. Contest with Friars, v. 41. Power of, unshaken, vi. 394. Celestial, 403. Ascendancy of, 578. Jealous of diffusion of books, 626. Decline of its power, 627.

Hierarchy, Anglo-Norman, iii. 440.

Hierarchy, English, vi. 98. Commons petition against, 108.

Hierarchy of France, ii. 220.

Hierarchy of Germany, becomes Teutonic, ii. 312. Aristocratic, 329. Its great increase of power, 360.

Hierarchy, Transalpine, its perpetuity, ii. 360. Supersedes feudal nobility, 361. Sanctions divorce of Theutberga, 364.

Hilarius at Synod of Ephesus, i. 205. Made Pope, 224. Rebukes Anthemius, 225.

Hilarius, Archbishop of Arles, i. 192. Denies Papal jurisdiction, 193. His death, 194. Condemned by Valentinian III., 195.

Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, urges Becket to resign, iii. 471.

Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans, iv. 177.

Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII.

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, ii. 368. Accepts False Decretals, 378. Supports Charles the Bald, 385. Letters to Hadrian II., 385, 389. His cruelty to his nephew, 391. Persecutes Gotschalk, iii. 350.

Hincmar, Bishop of Laon (nephew of Archbishop Hincmar), ii. 387. His quarrel with his uncle, 388. Supported by Pope Hadrian II., 389. Is blinded, 391.

Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, i. 37. Probable author of the 'Refutation of all Heresies,' 42. His strictures on Pope Callistus, 45. His banishment to Sardinia, and martyrdom at Rome, 47.

Historical Christian poets, vi. 488.

History, Latin, vi. 505.

Hohenburg, battle of, iii. 131.

Hohenstaufen, house of, iii. 411.

Holy Island, or Lindisfarne, ii. 67.

Holy Land, reverence for, iii. 223.

Honorius I., Pope, acknowledges Monothelitism, ii. 124.

Honorius II. (Lambert of Ostia), Papal legate at Worms, iii. 320. Elected Pope, 324. His peace with Emperor Lothair, 325.

Honorius III., Pope, supports Simon de Montfort, iv. 235. Honours St. Dominic, 256. Repose of his popedom, 284. His mildness, 285. Urges the Crusade, 286. His correspondence with Frederick II., 289. Crowns Frederick, 293. His letter to Frederick, 301. Arbitrates between Frederick and the Lombard League—his death, 302. His relations with England, 304. Assumes protection of Henry III. of England, 305. His claim on English benefices, 309.

Honorius IV., Pope, v. 123.
Honorius, Emperor, his inactivity, i. 89. Espouses the cause of Chrysostom, 93. Destroys Stilicho, 96. His supineness during Alaric's invasions, 100. His rescript against Pelagianism, 125.
Hope, on Architecture, vi. 566.
Hormisdas, Pope, supports Vitalianus, i. 247. Appealed to by Emperor Anastasius, 308. His embassy to Constantinople, 309. His demands, 310. His second embassy, 311. Excites subjects of Empire against Anastasius, 312. Establishes his authority in the East, 314.
Horses sacrificed by Teutons, i. 261.
Hosius of Cordova, i. 60, 62.
Hospitallers, iv. 123. Their opposition to Frederick II. in Palestine, 335.
Hroswitha, vi. 496. Her religious comedies, 497.
Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, death of, iv. 82.
Hugh Capet, ii. 487.
Hugh of Provence, ii. 456. Marries Marozia, 458. Driven out of Rome, 460. His palace at Pavia, 461. Conspiracy against, 462. Is deserted, retires to Provence, and dies, 463.
Hugh of Lyons, his letters to Countess Matilda, iii. 205.
Hugo the White, his charges against Gregory VII., iii. 149.
Humfred, Archbishop of Ravenna, deposed by Pope Leo IX., iii. 28. Dies, 29.
Humfrey, Norman prince, iii. 34. Conducts Leo IX. to Rome, 37.
Hungarians, ferocity of, ii. 444. Extent of their ravages, 445. Resist expedition of Peter the Hermit, iii. 240.
Hungary occupied by Magyars, ii. 448. Conversion of, iii. 29. Affairs of, iv. 120. The Master of, v. 37.
Huns, terrors of their invasion, i. 213.
Huss, John, arrives at Constance, vi. 160. Previous history of, 164. Rector of university of Prague, 166. His reception at Constance, 169. Imprisoned, 171. Abandoned by Emperor, 177. His doctrine, 199. Is urged to recant, 200. Interrogation of, 201. Brought before Council, 202. Charges against, 203. His boldness, 204. Refuses to retract, 206. His writings burned, 209. Degradation of, 210. Execution of, 211. Was a martyr to the hierarchy, 212. Severe treatment of, 218.
Hussite War, vi. 245. Atrocity of, 246.
Hussites, their successes, vi. 249. Invade Germany, 250.
Hymns, Latin, vi. 491.
Hypatia murdered by partisans of Cyril, i. 148.

I, J.

Jacob de Mies, his opinions about administration of Cup to Laity, vi. 200. Condemned by Council of Constance, 208.
Jacopone da Todi, Franciscan poet, v. 141. Verses against Boniface VIII., 215.

Jago, St., of Compostella, vi. 419.
James I. of Arragon, prisoner to Simon de Montfort, iv. 225. Subjection of to Clement IV., v. 73.
James, King of Sicily, v. 124. Succeeds to throne of Arragon, 127. Makes treaty with Angevines, 155.
Jane of Burgundy, v. 401.
Iceland, Innocent III.'s letter to Bishops of, iv. 120.
Iconoclasm, begun by Leo the Isaurian, ii. 144. Nature of controversy, 145. Was premature, 147. Important points involved in, 149. Causes tumults at Constantinople, 157. Condemned by Second Council of Nicea, 186. Suppressed, 191. Revived by Theophilus, 199. Abhorrence of in the West, 205. Enjoined by edict at Ravenna, 207. Directed against statues, 596.
Idolatry alleged against Templars, v. 339. Against Boniface VIII., 374.
Jean Petit asserts legality of murder, vi. 218.
Jerome, denounces vices of Roman church, i. 71. His influence over noble ladies, 73. Author of the Vulgate, 74. Retires from Rome, 75. His account of the sack of Rome, 102. Resists Pelagius, 111. Persecuted by Pelagians, 112.
Jerome of Prague, joins Huss at Constance, vi. 197. His imprisonment and retractation, 214. Recants his recantation—his condemnation, 215. His courage and execution, 216.
Jerusalem, Church of, always subordinate, i. 84. Violent quarrels at, 227. Besieged by Mohammedans, ii. 40. Capitulates, 41. Capture of by crusaders, iii. 239. Loss of, 543. Yielded by treaty to Frederick II., iv. 340.
Jews at Alexandria, i. 146, 147. Protected by Theodoric, 317. Of Arabia, their strife with Mohammed, ii. 21. Their rudeness, 25. Persecution of in France, iii. 227. Massacred by Crusaders, 249. Protected by Henry IV., 264. Protected by S. Bernard, 401. Plundered by King Philip, v. 187, 282. Persecuted by French peasantry, 445.
Ignatius, martyrdom of, i. 27.
Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, ii. 346. Banished by Emperor Michael III., 347. His sufferings, 348. Appears before Papal legates — persecution of, 350. His restoration and death, 357.
Ignorance, religious, of lower orders, iv. 243.
Illyricum, church of, subject to that of Rome, i. 198.
Images, alleged miracles in defence of, ii. 157. Precedents for, vi. 596.
Image-worship, ii. 148. Edict against, 154. condemned by Council of Constantinople, 171. Measures of Theophilus against, 199. Restored by Theodora, 202. Prevails in Italy, 205. Condemned in Western empire, 338.
'*Imitation* of Christ,' vi. 482. Influence of, 483. Not sacerdotal, 484. Remarkable omission in, 485.
Immaculate Conception, vi. 416.

Immunities of clergy, iii. 459. Abolished by Council of Clarendon, 464. Becket the martyr of, 527. Resisted by Edward I., vi. 95.

Indulgences, vi. 429. Sale of, 124, 622. In Bohemia, 167.

Infanticide, laws of Justinian against, i. 371.

Ingelurga of Denmark, married to Philip Augustus, iv. 63. Incurs his aversion, 64. Imprisoned, 70. Reinstated, 72. Neglected, 75.

Innocent I., Pope, i. 87. Asserts Roman supremacy, 89. His dominion over the western churches, 90. Supports Chrysostom, 93. Present at first siege of Rome by Alaric, 98. Embraces opinions of Augustine, 119. Pronounces against Pelagius, 120. His death, 121.

Innocent II., iii. 325. His contest with Anacletus, 326. Supported by transalpine sovereigns, 327. Retires to France, 337. At Rheims—ruled by S. Bernard, 338. Visits Clairvaux—acknowledged by sovereigns, 339. Advances to Rome, 340. At Pisa, 341. Holds Lateran Council, 342. His wars, 345. Condemns Abélard, 375. Insurrection against in Rome, 391. His death, 392.

Innocent III., iv. 9. Elected Pope, 11. His policy, 13, and administration, 13, 14. His wars in Italy, 15, 16. War with Markwald of Anweiler, 19. Establishes power in Italy, 20. His claims on kingdom of Naples, 21. Guardian of Frederick II., 22. Engages Walter of Brienne, 26. Fosters strife in Germany, 33. His demands on Philip the Hohenstaufen, 34. His policy in Germany, 37, 39. Address to German envoys, 40. His 'Deliberation,' 41. Declares Otho Emperor, 45. Forced to acknowledge Philip, 52. Crowns Otho IV., 54. His quarrel with Otho, 55, 56. Supports Frederick II., 58. Forbids divorce of Philip Augustus, 65. Mediates between Philip and Richard of England, 66. Places France under Interdict, 67. Compels restoration of Ingeburga, 72. His alliance with Richard I., 76. His laxity in King John's divorce, 78. Quarrels with King John, 82. Appoints Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, 84. Places England under Interdict, 86. Excommunicates John, 89. Declares his deposition, 91. Obtains surrender of England, 95. His commanding position, 96. Takes part with King John—rebukes Langton and the barons, 103. Condemns Magna Charta, 105. Excommunicates barons, 106. Excommunicates Philip Augustus, 109. His death, 109. His measures in Spain, 112. Condemns marriage of Alfonso of Leon—threatens Leon and Castile with Interdict, 114. Crowns Pedro of Arragon, 118. Receives fealty of Arragon, 119. His policy towards Bohemia, Denmark, and Hungary, 120. Urges the crusade, 124. Requires contributions, 125. Fails to rouse zeal, 128. Prohibits commerce with Saracens, 133. Receives Alexius Comnenus, 137. Forbids expedition to Zara, 139. Condemns expedition to Constantinople, 143. Receives addresses of Baldwin and the Venetians, 152. His answers, 153. Sends Cardinal Benedict legate to Constantinople, 158. Recommends toleration of Greeks, 159. Mediates between Franks and Bulgarians, 161. Seeming peace of his Popedom, 169. His measures against heretics in south of France, 194. His letter to Count Raymond, 200. Commands crusade against Provence, 201. His crafty conduct, 205, 213. Receives Raymond at Rome, 214. His hesitation, 223. Holds Lateran Council, 228. Dispute before him, 231. Overborne by violence of prelates, 232. Shows favour to young Raymond of Toulouse, 233. His death, 234. Sanctions Dominican and Franciscan orders, 259. His reception of St. Francis, 265. His character, 277. Review of his pontificate, 278–281.

Innocent IV., iv. 418. His correspondence with Frederick II., 419. Enters Rome, 421. Negotiates with Emperor, 421. His flight to Genoa, 423. To Lyons, 424. Excommunicates Emperor, 425. Offers to visit England, 427. His insecurity at Lyons, 428. Gifts to, from French prelates, 429. At Council of Lyons, 430. His address, 431. Declares deposition of Emperor, 433. Claims temporal authority, 437. His crusade against Emperor, 438. Rejects mediation of Louis of France, 440. Attempts to raise Germany, 441. Declares Henry of Thuringia Emperor, 444. Makes William of Holland Emperor, 445. His conduct after Frederick's death, 455. Confers crown of Naples on Prince Edmund of England, 458. Aims at possession of Naples, 462. Manfred's submission to, 464. His entry into Naples, 465. Offers realm to Charles of Anjou — his death, 466. Visions regarding, 467. Resisted by Robert Grostête, 471. His indifference to crusade of St. Louis, v. 10. His bull subjecting Mendicant Orders, 45.

Innocent V., v. 94.

Innocent VI., v. 547. His tranquil Papacy, 548. Acquiesces in Golden Bull, 549. His death, 553.

Innocent VII., vi. 52. His flight from Rome, and return, 54. Death of, 55.

'*Innocents*, Massacre of,' a mystery, vi. 494.

Inquisition founded, iv. 238. Of Toulouse, v. 16. Form of procedure in, 17. Placed under Friar Preachers, 18. Rebellion against, 19. In France—condemned by Philip the Fair, 243. On Franciscan heretics, 438.

Inquisitor in France, examines Templars, v. 303.

Inquisitors murdered, v. 19. Expelled from Parma, 425.

Institutes of Charlemagne, ii. 293.

Institutes of Justinian, make no mention of Christianity, i. 359.

Insurrections, religious, v. 36.

Intellectual movement, iv. 245.

Interdict at Rome, iii. 410. Commanded by Becket, 505. In France, iv. 67. Terror of, 68. Raised, 72. In England, 86. Effects of, 87. In Germany, v. 489. Force of, vi. 391. Disused, 631.

Investiture, iii. 138. Lay, forbidden by Gregory VII., 139. Settled by Henry V. and Pope Paschal II., 284. Settled by concordat of Worms, 319. Question of in England, 439.

Joachim, Abbot, his 'Eternal Gospel;'—prophecies, v. 417.

Joanna of Naples, v. 508. Appeals to Rienzi, 523.

Joanna II. of Naples, her conduct to rival Popes, vi. 20. Is put to death, 21.

Job, book of, Gregory the Great on, i. 435.

Johannitius, King of Bulgaria, his victory at Adrianople, iv. 160. Pope Innocent's letter to—his reply, 161.

John, St., knights of, rivals of Templars, v. 288. Conquer Rhodes, 290.

John I., Pope, ambassador to Constantinople, i. 321. His instructions from Theodoric, 322. Results of his mission uncertain, 323. Imprisonment of, and death, 324.

John II., i. 334. Receives embassy from East, 335.

John III., reinstates bishops in Gaul, i. 347. Intercedes with Narses, 348.

John V., ii. 139.

John VI., ii. 141.

John VII., ii. 141.

John VIII., restores Photius, ii. 357. His position, 392. Crowns Charles the Bald Emperor, 393. His alarm at Saracens, 395. His war with Naples, 397. Pays tribute to Saracens, 399. Seized by Lambert—flies to France — calls council of Troyes, 400. Crowns Louis the Stammerer—his frequent excommunications, 401. Adopts Boso, Duke of Lombardy—Endeavours to assemble council at Pavia, 402. Excommunicates Anspert, Archbishop of Milan, 403. Crowns Charles the Fat Emperor, 404. Proposes to massacre the Saracens, 405. Writes to Charles the Fat—his death, 406. Conspiracy against, 407.

John IX., ii. 416.

John X., the paramour of Theodora, ii. 452. Translated from Ravenna, 453. Forms league against Saracens—crowns Berengar, 454. Defeats the Saracens—his contest with Marozia, 455. His imprisonment and death, 457.

John XI., son of Marozia, ii. 458. Imprisoned by Alberic—his death, 460.

John XII., ii. 464. Crowns Otho I.—his treachery, 467. Flies from Rome, 468. Cited to appear—refuses, 470. His return to Rome, and death, 471.

John XIII., expelled by Romans, ii. 472. Restored by Otho I., 473.

John XIV., imprisoned by Bonifazio—his death, ii. 475.

John XV., ii. 476.

John XVI. *See* Philagathus.

John XVII., ii. 500.

John XVIII., ii. 500.

John XXI., crowns Conrad, ii. 504.

John XXI., v. 94. Stories regarding his death, 95.

John XXII., election of, v. 409. His previous history, 410. Establishes Popedom at Avignon — appoints Cardinals, 411. His briefs to French King, 412. His belief in magic, 413. His avarice, 434. Persecutes Spiritualists, 437. Bull against Franciscans, 440. His Italian policy, 449. League with Robert of Naples, 450. Process against Louis of Bavaria, 453. Excommunicates Galeazzo Visconti and Louis, 455. His league with Charles the Fair, 456. His deposition declared, 472. Commands prayers in his behalf, 477. Reconciled with the Visconti, 478. Death of his enemies, 479. Accused of heresy, 481. His estrangement from French King, 484. His recantation and death, 485. His wealth and venality, 486. His character, 487.

John XXIII. (Balthasar Cossa), at Pisa, vi. 74. Character of, 80. Previous history, 81. Legate at Bologna, 82. His election, 84. Quarrel with Ladislaus of Naples, 87. Consents to Council, 90. His interview with Sigismund, 91. His journey to Constance, 158. His policy, 161. His reception of Huss, 169. His supremacy in the Council, 172. Threatening signs against, 177. His cession demanded, 180. Charges against, 181. Promises to abdicate, 183. Demands upon, 184. Interview with Sigismund, 187. Flight, 188. Letter to Council, 189. At Schaffhausen—his complaints, 191. His conduct and weakness, 192. At Fribourg, 195. Surrenders, 196. His imprisonment, 197. Lenient treatment of, 217. Submits to Pope Martin V., 232. Is named Cardinal—dies at Florence, 233.

John of England, his accession, iv. 77. Divorces his wife and marries Isabella, 78. War with Philip Augustus—flies to England, 80. His loss of Normandy, 81. His quarrel with Innocent III., 82–87. Oppresses clergy, 88. Excommunicated, 89. His folly and profligacy, 90. Declared deposed, 91. Collects forces—His desperation—threatens to embrace Mohammedanism, 92. His weakness, 93. Submits to Papal Legate, 94. Surrenders England to Pope, 95. His absolution, 98. Second surrender of the realm, 101. Conciliates the clergy, 102. Supported by Pope, 103. Signs Magna Charta, 104. Released from oath by Pope, 106. His war with Barons, 106. Death and character, 110. His surrender of realm declared void by Parliament, vi. 111.

John Talajas, i. 233.

John, Bishop of Antioch, attempts to appease Nestorian strife, i. 154. At Council of Ephesus, 165. Resists Cyril and Memnon, 167. His league with Cyril, 174. Alienates his own supporters, 175. Enforces their submission, 176.

John, Imperial Commissary at Ephesus, i. 168. Arrests the contending prelates, 169.

John, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 243.

John of Cappadocia, Bishop of Constantinople, his ambition, i. 313. Universal Bishop, 450.

John of Damascus, his origin, ii. 163. Writes against Iconoclasm, 165. His three orations, 166.

John, Archbishop of Ravenna, resists Nicolas I., ii. 358. Forced to submit, 359.

John Crescentius, Patrician of Rome, ii. 501.
John of Salisbury, friend of Becket, iii. 452. His advice to Becket, 483. At Canterbury, 521.
John of Oxford, ambassador at Wurzburg, iii. 484. Excommunicated by Becket, 488. His intrigues at Rome, 491. At Benevento, 509. Reinstates Becket, 515.
John, King of Jerusalem, in the West, iv. 297. His quarrel with Frederick II., 299.
John, Prince of Naples, v. 390.
John of Bohemia invades Italy, v. 481, 506. Slain at Crecy, 507.
Joinville, Seneschal of St. Louis, v. 15.
Iolante, of Jerusalem, marries Frederick II., iv. 298. Her death, 320.
Iona, ii. 66.
Joppa occupied by Frederick II., iv. 336.
Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople, his vanity, vi. 271. His reception at Ferrara, 277. Indignities to, 279. His death, 290.
Ireland, papal grant of to Henry II., iii. 409. Examination of Templars in, v. 351.
Irenæus, Bishop of Vienne, appeases strife about Easter, i. 36.
Irene, ii. 179. Empress, 181. Favours image-worship, 182. Summons Council at Nicea, 184. Her intrigues against her son, 190. Seizes and blinds him, 191.
Irish founders of monasteries, ii. 108.
Irmin-Saule, a Saxon idol, destroyed by Charlemagne, ii. 283.
Iron age of Christianity, ii. 448.
Isaac Angelus, Eastern emperor, iv. 137.
Isabella of England, Empress, iv. 381.
Isidore of Pelusium, i. 174.
Isidore of Rossano, vi. 313.
Islip, Simon, Archbishop, founds Canterbury Hall, vi. 106.
Italian clergy in England, iv. 308, 471. Popular threats against, 309.
Italian defenders of Boniface VIII., v. 367.
Italian houses of Papal origin, vi. 620.
Italian language at Court of Frederick II., iv. 368. Of Boccaccio, v. 518.
Italian nobles, lawlessness of, ii. 396.
Italian politics, v. 449. (Time of Nicolas V.), vi. 338.
Italian prelates, ii. 460. Decline of their power, vi. 387.
Italian Schoolmen, vi. 499.
Italy under the Ostrogoths, i. 293. Invaded by Lombards, 348, 427. Papal policy fatal to, 349. Monasticism in, 412. Weakened by Byzantine conquest, 429. Overrun by Lombards, 455. Invaded by Saracens, ii. 342. State of (10th century), 446. Southern, state of (11th century), iii. 33. Northern, violent contests in, 89. Climate of, fatal to German popes, 102. Married clergy in, 110. State of, at accession of Innocent III., iv. 18. Becomes subject to papal power, 20. Strife in cities of, 292. State of (13th century), 299. State of (time of Urban IV.), v. 56. Wars in, 129. Arrest of Templars in, 352. Affairs of (time of Clement V.), 335. State of, after death of Henry of Luxemburg, 394. Defection of from Louis of Bavaria, 478. State of (time of Urban V.), 555, 557; (Gregory XI.),

562. Antipapal league in, 563. State of in papal schism, vi. 33. State of (Martin V.), 233. Great houses of, 388. States of, under princes, 620.
'*Itinerary* of the soul to God,' vi. 465.
Jubilee (A.D. 1300), v. 208. Pilgrims to, 209. Every fiftieth year, 501, 513. Its celebration, 536. Irregular, proclaimed by Urban VI., vi. 29. Held by Boniface IX., 41. Numerous attendance at (A.D. 1450), 330.
Judaism, its hold at Rome, i. 33, 35. Displayed in the Clementina, 33.
Judgment, Last, Golias on, vi. 504.
Judith, second wife of Louis the Pious, ii. 320. Accused of adultery, 325. Compelled to become a nun, 327. Declared innocent, 328. A prisoner, 332. Restored to her husband, 335. Reconciles Louis to Lothair, 337.
Julian, Emperor, i. 67.
Julianus, Bishop of Eclana, founder of Semi-Pelagianism, i. 125. His history—deposed by Pope Zosimus, 126. Exile and persecution of, 127. Last years and death, 128.
Julius I., Pope, i. 61, 62.
Jurisprudence, Christian, i. 351, 352.
Jurisprudence, Ecclesiastical, i. 398.
Justin, Emperor, his ignorance, i. 313. Adheres to Chalcedonian council—closes the forty years' schism, 314. Persecutes Arians, 321.
Justin II. supersedes Narses, i. 347.
Justinian, revives greatness of Rome, i. 328. Character of—subservience to Empress Theodora, 329. Wars, 331. His conquest of Africa, 332. Intercourse with Italy, 333, 335. His conquest of Italy, 336. His theological interference, 340. Disputes with Pope Vigilius, 342, 343. Buildings of, vi. 570.
Justinian's code, i. 354; vi. 571. Was Christian, i. 355. Asserts orthodoxy—regulations for clergy, 356. Bishops, 357. Monasteries, 358.
Justinian's Institutes, purely Roman, i. 358. Silence about Christianity, 359. On Slavery, 360. On Parental Power, 363, 371. On Marriage, 363. On Concubinage, 369. Infanticide, 371. Heresy, 376.
Justinian II., Emperor, deposed, ii. 140, and restored, 141.
Justinian, nephew of Justin, assassinates Vitalianus, i. 314.
Juvenalis, Bishop of Jerusalem, i. 161.

K.

Kameel, Sultan of Egypt, negotiates with Frederick II., iv. 322. His policy in Syria, 337. His treaty with Frederick, 339.
Kempis, à, Thomas, vi. 482.
Khaled, his victory over Moscilama, ii. 36.
Khoosroo, King of Persia, rejects Islamism—defeated by Heraclius, ii. 32.
Kings in Western Europe become monks, ii. 231.
Kirkshot, ii. 98.
Kiss of peace, iii. 507.
Knighthood, iii. 253; religious ceremonies of, 254.
Knights, the four, of Henry II., iii. 519.

Their altercation with Becket, 520. Murder him, 522. Their fate, 523.

Koran, doubts of its authenticity, ii. 13. Becomes intolerant to Jews, 24. Commands war against unbelievers, 30. (*See* Mohammedanism.)

Koreishites, the tribe of Mohammed, ii. 17. Persecute him, 18.

L.

Ladislaus, King of Naples, his policy at Rome, vi. 53. Repulsed from Rome, 54. Second attempt, 57. His influence over Gregory XII., 58. In Rome, 59. Protects Gregory XII., 78. Occupies Rome, 79. Defeated at Rocca Secca, 84. His treaty with John XXIII., 86. Plunders Rome, 88. His death, 93.

Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, plunders Rome, ii. 396. Assists John VIII. against Naples, 397. His violence to the Pope, 400.

Lambert, son of Guido, claims kingdom of Italy, ii. 412.

Lambert, Duke of Tuscany, seized and blinded by Hugh of Provence, ii. 459.

Lambert of Hertzfield, vi. 506.

Landowners, ecclesiastical, vi. 369.

Lanfranc opposes Berengar, iii. 23. At Bec, 436. Made Primate of England, 437. His death, 438.

Langland, supposed author of Piers Ploughman's Vision, vi. 537.

Langton, Simon, Archbishop of York, iv. 107.

Langton, Stephen, made Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope, iv. 84. Rejected by King John, 86. Heads Barons' party, 99. Resists Papal Legate, 101. His conduct in contest with Barons, 102. At Rome, 108. Supports Dominicans, 257.

Languages, new, favour religious movement, iv. 246. Modern, vi. 507-624. English, 507. Italian, 510. Romance and Teutonic, 527.

Langue d'Oil, vi. 524.

Languedoc, heresies in, iv. 190. Manners of, 191. State of, 193.

Lanzo of Milan, iii. 59.

Lapsi, controversy about at Carthage, i. 48. At Rome, 49. Spanish Bishops among the, 54.

Lateran Council (Second), iii. 49. Settles Papal elections, 50. Condemns Berengar of Tours, 51. Scene at, 152, 321. Under Innocent II., 342. Decrees of, 343, 344. Condemns Arnold of Brescia, 388. (Fourth), iv. 228. Secret history of, 229.

Latin Christendom, churches in, vi. 563.

Latin Christianity compared with Greek, i. 5, 6. Its main controversy, that of grace and free will, 7. Its Imperial character, 8. Its centre the Roman Pontificate, 18. Unity of its history, 19. Epochs in its history, 19-22. Arose in Africa, 29. Tertullian, its first great writer, 30. Cyprian, its parent, 47. Unity of, gradually established, 53. Its dominion arose away from Rome, 79. Was anti-Pelagian—its tendency

to predestinarianism, 115; and to sacerdotalism. 116. Indifferent to Eastern disputes, 137. Its three great Fathers—its two first founders, 221. Germany converted to, ii. 118. At Constantinople, iv. 147. Weakness of, 242. Culminates, vi. 332. Its appointed work, 333. Learned age of, 352. Its strength and vitality, 396. Influence of, in France, 521. Secession from, 627. Authority of weakened, 628. Its enduring power, 629. Its strength and weakness, 630. Its intolerance—objectiveness of, 631. Tendencies of, 632.

Latin Church, separation of from Greek, i. 58. In Constantinople, iv. 159. Jealousies in, 160.

Latin Empire. *See* Empire.

Latin language, prevalence of in Western Church, i. 8, 402. Use of in the Church, ii. 426. Universal language, vi. 378. Maintained by Christianity, 433. Has discharged its mission, 507. Late, barbarism of, 513. Religious terms in, 529. Disuse of, 624.

Latin monasticism, energy of, i. 6.

Latin race retains its hold on Church, i. 257. Nations descended from, vi. 629.

Laurentius, rival of Symmachus for Papacy, i. 253. Rejected by Theodoric, 303. Excites tumults at Rome, 305.

Laurentius, Bishop, succeeds Augustine at Canterbury, ii. 61, 62.

Lavaur, capture of—cruelties on the captives, iv. 222.

Law, three systems of, i. 354. Supremacy of, iv. 360.

Laws of Theodoric and Athalaric, i. 378. Ostrogothic, 379. Lombard, Burgundian and Visigoth, 380. Salic, 381. Against heretics, iv. 361.

Lawyers, French, v. 175, 226. Biassed against Templars, 355.

Learning becomes independent of Church, vi. 623.

Lebuin preaches to the Saxons, ii. 282.

Legates, preachers of crusade, ii. 244. At Besançon, iii. 418. Of Alexander III., Becket's appearance before, 495. Meet Henry II.—their inhibition against Becket, 496. In Germany, iv. 46. Their contest with Provençal heresy, 195. Their demands on Count Raymond, 218. In England, 306, 309. Peaceful character of, vi. 380.

Legacies to the Roman Church, i. 71.

Legends, growth of, and importance, i. 466. Were not mere frauds, 475. Of Saints, vi. 421. Popular, Latinised, 489. Represented in action, 495.

Legnano, battle of, iii. 535.

Leicester, Wycliffism at, vi. 140.

Leo I., Pope, the Great, his preaching, i. 29. His pontificate and greatness, 178. His early distinction and election, 179. Preaches on Roman supremacy, 180. Character of his sermons — denounces Manicheans, 182. His contest with Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, 193. His letter to Bishops of Vienne, 194. His authority upheld by Valentinian III., 195. Appealed to in Eutychian question, 203. His letter to Flavianus against Eutyches, 204. Rejects

sentence of Ephesian Synod, 206. His letter read at Chalcedon, 208. His adulation of Eastern Emperors—ambassador to Attila, 213. Success of his embassy, 215. Goes to meet Genseric, 217. His death, 221.

Leo II., ii. 138.

Leo III., ii. 266. Attempt to mutilate—his visit to Charlemagne, 267. Clears himself of charges, 269. Crowns Charlemagne emperor, 270. His alliance with Charlemagne, 272. His magnificence, 309. His danger from insurrection, 310. His death, 314.

Leo IV., ii. 342. Strengthens Roman fortifications, 343.

Leo V., ii. 448.

Leo VIII., made Pope by Otho I., ii. 470. Dies, 472.

Leo IX. (Bruno), Bishop of Toul—his piety, iii. 6. His pilgrimage to Rome, 7. His election and reforms, 8. Visitation beyond the Alps, 11. His visions, 12. Visits France, 13. Consecrates St. Remi's church, holds council of Rheims, 14. At Mentz, 17. Returns to Rome, 18. Holds council at Vercelli, 25. Second transalpine journey, 27. At Toul, 28. His third journey, 29. His mediation in Hungarian war rejected, 30. Meets Henry III. at Worms, 31. Marches against Normans, 33. Letter to Eastern Emperor, 34. Defeated, 35. His detention and penance, 36. His return to Rome, death and sanctity, 37.

Leo the Thracian, Emperor, i. 230.

Leo the Isaurian, early history of, ii. 153. Saves Constantinople—persecutes Jews and heretics, 154. Edicts of against image-worship, 154, 156. Suppresses *tumult*, 157. Resisted by Pope and clergy, 158. His measures against Gregory II., 212. Expedition to Italy—shipwrecked, 214.

Leo IV., Emperor, ii. 180, 181.

Leo the Armenian, his victories, ii. 192. Proscribes image-worship, 193. Murdered by conspirators, 194.

Leodegar (St. Leger), Bishop of Autun, ii. 222. His death, 223.

Leon, affairs of, iv. 113. Threatened with Interdict, 114.

Leonine city, ii. 343; vi. 354.

Leopold, Imperial Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 48.

Leopold of Austria, v. 458. His death, 462.

Leovigild, Arian King of Spain, i. 446.

Lepan, battle of, vi. 264.

Lepus, persecution of, v. 445.

Letters, revival of, vi. 621, 623.

Liberius, Pope, his contest with Constantius, i. 63. His exile, 64. Restored, 66. Tumults at his death, 67.

Library, Vatican, vi. 350, 353.

Lies, Field of, ii. 331.

Limousin Cardinals, vi. 5.

Lincoln, battle of, iv. 305. Parliament of, v. 217.

Lindisfarne, bishopric of, founded, ii. 67.

Literature, Christian, vi. 434.

Liutprand, King of Lombards, ii. 206. Takes Ravenna, 207. Marches to Rome,

210. Quarrels with Gregory III., 217. His interview with Pope Zacharias, 228. Grants peace, 229. Attacks the Exarchate, 229. Abandons his conquests, 230. His death, 232.

Liutpold, Archbishop of Mentz, iii. 31. Insults Leo IX., 32.

Liutprand, ii. 457. Attends Otho I. to Rome, 489. Ambassador at Constantinople, 473.

Lok, identified with Satan, vi. 408.

Lollards, vi. 138. Their petition to Parliament, 140. Statute against, 143. Measures of Henry V. against, 152.

Lombard laws, 380. League, iv. 300, 302. Republics, 377. Architecture, vi. 581.

Lombards invade Italy, i. 348, 427. Their barbarity and Arianism, 428. Their ferocity, 454. Overrun Italy, 455. Converted from Arianism, 458. Powerful kingdom of, ii. 206. Detested by Popes, 207. Their disunion, 247. Rise against Frederick Barbarossa, iii. 533. Gain victory at Legnano, 535. Dissatisfied with truce of Venice, 536. Make treaty of Constance, 539. Wars of with Frederick II., iv. 316. Support King Henry's rebellion, 381. Defeated at Corte Nuova, 383.

Lombardy, Iron Crown of, iii. 56; v. 387. Pacification of by Gregory X., 83. Churches of, vi. 572.

Lomenie, Viscount, process against for wealth of Clement V., v. 434.

London, bishopric of, ii. 61, 70. Adheres to barons' party—citizens of, excommunicated, iv. 109. Populace of supports Wycliffe, vi. 121. Lollardism of, 139.

Loria, Roger, his naval victory over Angevines, v. 122. Revolts against Frederick of Arragon, 159. Alleged conversation with Boniface VIII.; 374.

Lothair, Emperor, ii. 340.

Lothair, King of Italy, ii. 319. At Rome, 322, 323. Asserts imperial supremacy, 324. His rebellion, 327, 330. Emperor, 340. Picture of his homage, iii. 418.

Lothair II., King of Lorraine—divorces his queen Theutberga, ii. 363. Marries Waldrada, 365. His submission to Nicolas I., 368. Compelled to reinstate Theutberga, 370. At Rome, 382. His death, 383.

Lothair, son of Hugh of Provence—King of Italy—his death, ii. 463.

Lothair the Saxon, Emperor, iii. 325. Supports Innocent II., 327. Conducts him to Rome, 340. Crowned at Rome—returns to Germany, 341. Conquers South Italy, 342.

Louis the Pious, his monkish tastes, ii. 311. His first measures, 312. Holds Diets at Aix-la-Chapelle, 313, 315. His church laws, 316. Settles the succession, 317. Puts down rebellion of Bernhard, 319. Marries Judith, 320. His penance, 321. Decay of his power, 324. His sons' rebellion, 326. Revolution in his favour, 327. His sons' second rebellion, 330. Deserted by his army, 331. A prisoner—his penance, 332. Re-action in his favour, 335. Reconciled to Lothair—divides the empire between Lothair and Charles (the Bald), 337. His death, 338.

Louis II., Emperor—at Rome—overawed

LOUIS.

by Nicolas I., ii. 366. His claim to crown of Lorraine, 383. Is supported by Hadrian II., 384. His death, 392.

Louis the Stammerer, King of France, ii. 400.

Louis the Fat, of France, complains against Henry I. of England, iii. 312. Protects Innocent II., 387.

Louis VII., of France (the Young), assumes the Cross, iii. 400. Receives Pope Alexander III., 432. His hostility to Henry II., 477. At meeting near Gisors, 495. At Montmirail, 499. His war with Henry II., 500.

Louis VIII. of France, his claim to English crown, iv. 109. His crusade in Languedoc, 227. His second Crusade fails, 236. Overruns Languedoc—his death, 237. Deserted by English partisans, 305.

Louis IX. (St. Louis), his treaty with Raymond of Toulouse, iv. 237. His answer to Gregory IX., 401. Obtains release of Prelates from Emperor, 415. His cold reception of Innocent IV., 424. Attempts to mediate with Pope, 440. His minority, v. 4. His austerities, 5. Anecdotes of, 6. His virtues, 7. His impartiality in Church matters, 8. Determines on a crusade, 9. In Cyprus—at Damietta, 11. His defeat and captivity, 12. His release, 13. Appeals to Henry III. of England for aid, 14. Deserted by his brothers—returns to Europe, 15. Compared with Emperor Frederick II., 16, 21. Escapes being a persecutor, 16, 20. As a lawgiver, 21. On offences of clergy, 22. Enacts Pragmatic Sanction, 23, 83. Refuses crown of Naples, 56. His death, 85.

Louis le Hutin, King of France, death of, v. 412.

Louis of Bavaria, son of Louis the Pious, ii. 318. His rebellion, 330. Excluded from share of empire, 337. Unites with Charles the Bald, 385. His death, 394.

Louis of Bavaria, v. 447. His victory at Muhldorf, 452. Papal process against, 453. His apology, 454. Excommunicated, 455. His treaty with Frederick of Austria, 460, 461. Holds Diet of Spires as Emperor—meditates descent on Italy, 462. His war of writings with John XXII., 463. Declares the Pope a heretic, 467. Enters Italy—crowned at Milan — his quarrel with Galeazzo Visconti, 468. Enters Rome, 470. His coronation, 471. Declares John XXII. deposed, 472. Makes Antipope, 474. Leaves Rome, 476. Death of his adherents—seizes Pisa, 477. Defection of his followers, 478. Seeks reconciliation with Pope, 480. Negotiates with Benedict XII., 490. His anxiety for absolution, 491. Seeks alliance with Philip of Valois, 492. Meeting with Edward III.—appoints Edward imperial Vicar, 495. His weakness and fear of the Pope, 496. Excommunicated by Clement VI.—his vacillation, 502. Accepts terms, 503. Deserted by German electors, 506. His death, 507.

Louis, son of Lothair, in Rome, ii. 341.

Louis of Provence crowned Emperor—taken by Berengar and blinded, ii. 450.

MARCIA.

Louis of Anjou, adopted by Joanna of Naples, vi. 21. Invades Naples, 22. His death, 24.

Louis of Anjou, King of Sicily, assists escape of Benedict XIII., vi. 49. Reduces Rome, 79. His victory at Rocca Secca, 84. Returns to France, 85.

Low Countries, Painters of, vi. 618.

Lucifer, fall of, vi. 408.

Lucius II., Pope, attacks Rome, is killed, iii. 393.

Lucius III., Pope, iii. 539. His death, 540.

Luna, sacked by Northmen, ii. 432.

Lupercalia, continuance of, i. 225.

Luxemburg, Henry of, King of Romans, v. 309, 384. Enters Italy, 386. Crowned in Milan, 387. Takes Brescia—his poverty, 389.

Luxeuil, monastery at, ii. 102.

Luxury of clergy, iii. 382.

Lyons, Pope Innocent IV. at, iv. 424. Council of, 430. Declares Emperor Frederick II. deposed, 433. Second Council of, v. 91. Regulates Papal elections, 92. Papal coronation at, 279. Annexed by Philip the Fair, 395. Conclave at, 409.

Lyons, Poor Men of. *See* Poor Men.

M.

Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 241. His haughtiness to Emperor Anastasius, 244. Deposed and banished, 245.

Magic charged against Boniface VIII., v. 374. Trials for, 413.

Magna Charta, iv. 104. Condemned by Innocent III., 105.

'*Magna* Moralia,' by Gregory the Great, i. 435. Extensive acceptation of, 436.

Magyars in Hungary, ii. 448.

Majorian, his efforts to restore Rome, i. 220. His fall, 221.

Malebranca, Cardinal, v. 132.

Manasseh, Archbishop of Arles, ii. 462.

Manfred, son of Frederick II., iv. 450. Maintains kingdom of Naples for Conrad, 457. Assumes regency of Naples, 463. His dissimulation, 464. His revolt and flight, 465. His victory, 466. Gains Sicily and Naples, v. 24. Is made King, 31. His power, 55. Advances on Rome, 60. His defeat and death at Benevento, 65.

Manicheans, their obnoxious doctrines—condemned by Leo the Great, i. 183; and by Valentinian III., 184. In twelfth century, iv. 175. Persecution of, 190.

Manicheism, iv. 181. Its vitality, 186. In the West, 188. Survives persecution, 241.

Mantua, Council of, iii. 83.

Manuel, Emperor of Constantinople, intrigues in Italy, iii. 534.

Marcella, follower of Jerome, i. 73. Her sufferings at the taking of Rome, 105.

Marcellinus, his apostasy fabulous, i. 56.

Marcellinus, St., Cardinal, Papal legate in France, v. 248. His failure, and return to Rome, 251.

Marcellus, legend about, i. 55.

Marcia, Christian concubine of Commodus, i. 37.

MARCIAN.

Marcian marries Pulcheria, i. 207. Succeeds her in the Empire, 210. Dies, 230.

Marigni, Philip de, Archbishop of Sens, v. 332. His summary proceedings against Templars, 333.

Marguérite de la Porette, v. 402.

Marinus, Pope, ii. 407.

Mark, St., church of, at Venice, iii. 536.

Mark of Ephesus, vi. 286, 288. Resists union of Churches, 289.

Markwald of Anweiler, iv. 18. Stripped of power by Innocent III., 19. His intrigues in Sicily, 23. His hollow reconciliation with Pope, 24. Excommunicated—passes into Sicily, 25. Defeated by Papal troops, 26. His league with Walter the Chancellor, 27.

Marozia, daughter of Theodora, her vices and power at Rome, ii. 455. Her contest with Pope John X.—marries Guido Duke of Tuscany, 456. Destroys Pope John, 457. Raises her son, John XI.—marries Hugh of Provence, 458.

Marriage of clergy. *See* Clergy.

Marriage, law of, Justinian's, i. 363. Treated as a civil contract—early Roman law of, 364. Prohibited degrees of, 365. Prohibited with infamous persons, 366.

Marsilio of Padua, his book 'The Defender of Peace,' v. 463. His definition of the Church, 464. Rejects Papal pretensions, 465. Councillor of Louis of Bavaria, 501.

Martin I., Pope, ii. 130. Condemns Monothelitism, 131. Arrested by order of Constans, 132. Taken to Constantinople—cruel treatment of—imprisonment, 133; and death, 134.

Martin IV., his election, v. 101. His measures in French interest, 102. Proclaims crusade against Sicily, 114. Prohibits combat at Bordeaux, 119. His exertions against Peter of Arragon, 120, 121. His death, 123.

Martin V. (Otto Colonna), his election at Constance, vi. 224. His first act, 225. His address, 228. Grants separate Concordats, 229. His departure from Constance, 230. At Florence, 232. Generosity to rival Popes — his poverty, 233. In Rome, 234. Strengthens himself in Italy, 235. Condemns Statute of Præmunire, 237. Summons council at Pavia, 239. Prorogues it to Sienna—to Basle—dies, 240.

Martin, Cistercian Abbot, preaches Crusade, iv. 132.

Martin, St., vi. 419.

Martin, Pope's Nuncio in England, iv. 427.

Martina, Empress, banished, ii. 128.

Martyrologies, the ancient Roman untrustworthy, i. 23.

Martyrs, Franciscan, iv. 266.

Masses, vi. 374. Sale of, 394, 429.

'*Master* of Hungary,' the, v. 37. Leader of Shepherd insurgents, 38. In Paris, 39. Slain at Bourges, 40.

Matilda, her war with Stephen, iii. 440.

Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, a supporter of Pope Gregory VII., iii. 144. Her intercession for Henry IV., 169. Her territories wasted by Henry IV., 194. Visits Rome, 206. Continues firm to Papal party—marries Guelf of Bavaria, 211. Her war with

MILAN.

Henry IV., 212. Dissension with her husband, 218. Swears allegiance to Henry V., 282. Her death, 298.

Matrimonial questions, ii. 362.

Matthew Paris against Franciscans, iv. 276.

Maurice, Emperor, letters of Gregory the Great to, i. 451, 459. Jealous of Pope, 457, 461. His law about monastics, 459. Deposed by Phocas, 460. Murdered, 462.

Maur, St., disciple of Benedict, i. 419. Founds convents in France, 425.

Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople, a partisan of Cyril, i. 172.

Maximin, persecution by, ends discord in the Church, i. 47.

Maximus puts to death Priscillian, i 196. Assassinates Valentinian—marries Eudoxia—slain, 217.

Maximus, a monk, opposes Monothelitism—his cruel treatment by Constans, ii. 134.

Mecca, sanctity of, ii. 17. Mohammed's flight from, 19. Taken by Mohammed, 21. Becomes his capital, 22.

Mediæval art closed with Nicolas V., vi. 619.

Medical influence, vi. 359.

Medici, Cosmo de', vi. 623.

Medicine introduced among Arabs, vi. 442. Its connection with philosophy, 442.

Medina receives Mohammed, ii. 19.

Melchiades, Pope, i. 56.

Melchisedek, example of, quoted, i. 252.

Melun, Council of, decrees against heretics, iv. 240.

Meminon, Bishop of Ephesus, i. 161.

Memoirs, French origin of, vi. 526.

Menageries of Emperor Frederick II., iv. 368.

Mendicant Orders, iv. 244.

Mendicants hated by clergy, vi. 75. In England, 104. In Universities—attacked by Wycliffe, 105. Subsidies to, 376. Schoolmen, 450. Piers Ploughman on, 539. Cultivate art, 614.

Mendicants. *See* Friars.

Mentz, Archbishopric of, founded, ii. 113. Double election to, iv. 41.

Mentz, Council of, iii. 17.

Merovingian kings, polygamy of, and incestuous marriages, i. 287.

Merton College, vi. 102. Famous members of, 103.

Messina capitulates to insurgents, v. 113. Besieged by Charles of Anjou, 115.

Metaphysics and Theology, iii. 358; vi. 437.

Methodius, Greek missionary, ii. 420, 425. Archbishop of Moravia—at Rome, 427.

Metropolitan Sees under Charlemagne, ii. 295.

Michael III., the Drunkard, Eastern Emperor, ii. 347. His correspondence with Pope Nicolas I., 352. His murder, 355.

Michael the Stammerer, made Emperor by a conspiracy, ii. 194. His character, 195.

Middlesex, church property in, vi. 372.

Milan, Council of, i. 63. Archbishopric of, iii. 55. Dissensions in, 59. Tumults in, 64. Church of, asserts right of marriage, 61. In-

surrection in against Herlembald, 89. Disputed Bishopric, 300. Secret league of with Hadrian IV., 425. Revolt against Frederick Barbarossa, 431. Fall of, 433. Ruin and restoration of, 529. Heads Lombard league, iv. 300. Henry of Luxemburg crowned in, v. 387. Insurrection in, 388. Claims to dukedom of, vi. 335. Cathedral, 590.

Milo, Papal Legate, imposes penance on Count Raymond, iv. 206.

Milton, vi. 409.

Minerve, siege and capture of, iv. 216.

Minnesingers, vi. 535.

Minor Friars of St. Francis, iv. 268.

Miracles of St. Benedict, i. 416. Of St. Dominic, iv. 252.

Moadhin, Sultan of Damascus, iv. 331. His rivalry with Sultan Kameel, 337.

Modern languages, vi. 624.

Mohammed, his character and plans a problem, ii. 13. His early life, 14. His call to prophecy, 15. His visions, 16. Divine mission, 17. Slow progress, 17. Is persecuted, 18. His flight (Hegira)—received at Medina, 19. His advances to the Jews, 20. His war with the Jews—conquers Mecca, 21. Unites Arabia, 22. His growing intolerance, 23. To Jews, 24. To Christians, 25. His imperfect knowledge of Judaism and Christianity, 25. Contemplates vast conquests—his letters to kings, 31. His war with Romans, 33. His illness and death, 34.

Mohammedanism, appearance of, ii. 5. Energy of, 8. Its monotheism—similarity to Judaism, 9. Its fanciful tenets, 9, 10. Was not original, 10. Borrowed from Jewish legends, 11. Its four precepts: Prayer, Almsgiving, Fasting, Pilgrimage, 11, 12. Its articles of faith, 12. Progress of, 21. Recognises slavery, 27; and polygamy—its war against mankind, 28. Demands conversion or tribute, 31. Its energy greater than that of Christianity, 38. Aggressive, iii. 248. Averse to philosophy, vi. 441.

Mohammedans not disunited on the Prophet's death, ii. 35. Their conquest of Syria, 36. Fanaticism of, 38. Take Bosra, 39. Damascus, 40. Take Jerusalem, 41. Conquer Persia and Egypt, 43. Africa, 44. Causes of their increase, 48. Extent of their conquests, 49. Their rapid civilisation, 50. Their learning—expansion of their creed, 51. Defeated at Tours, 215. Formidable invasion of Gaul, 226. Permit pilgrimage to Jerusalem under restrictions, iii. 226. In Spain, defeated at Naves de Tolosa, iv. 112. Warfare against, 167. St. Francis among, 267. Dissensions among, 322. Anger of, at cession of Jerusalem, 345.

Mohawkas, Governor of Egypt, welcomes Mohammedan invaders, ii. 43.

Molay, Du, Grand Master of Templars, v. 291. At Paris, 292. His advice concerning the Holy Land, 294. His confession of charges, 302. Brought before commissioners, 319, 322. Misled by William de Plasian, 320. His character, 358. Brought up for sentence, 395. His speech, 396. Burned alive, 397. His prophecy—sympathy for, 398.

Molesme, monastery of, its origin, iii. 331.

'*Monarchiâ, de*,' Dante's treatise, v. 391.

Monarchianism introduced at Rome by Praxeas, i. 39. Why called Patripassianism, 41.

Monasteries, rules of Justinian for, i. 358. German, ii. 115. Plundered by great prelates, iii. 79. Older, their wealth, 330, and relaxed discipline, 331. Schools of, 353.

Monastic Orders, union of, vi. 377. Versifiers, 489. Amatory poetry, 499. Satiric poetry, 501. Historians, 505. Representations of Christ, 607. Painters, 615.

Monasticism, Greek, i. 4. Latin, 6. In Rome, 70, 72. Increasing power of, 73. Eastern and Western contrasted, 250. Of early English Church, ii. 78. Was suited to the times, 79. Revivals of, iii. 117, 328. The parent of intellectual movements, 346. Antagonistic to wealth of clergy, 381. Did not instruct the people, iv. 244.

Monasticism, Western. *See* Western.

Money, assessment of crimes for, i. 379, 395.

Mongols invade Europe, iv. 415. Defeated by Enzio, 417.

Monks, Eastern, i. 199. Turbulence of, 217. Their influence, 248. Evils of their tyranny and fanaticism, 249. Originally lay, 403. Law of Maurice about, 459. Resist Iconoclasm, ii. 174. Persecuted by Constantine Copronymus, 176. Contest with Seculars, iii. 78, 117. Numbers of, 362. Corruption of, vi. 386.

Monophysitism, iii. 224.

Monothelite controversy, ii. 123.

Monothelitism, its origin, ii. 123. A compromise with Monophysitism, 124.

Montanism, i. 37. Of Phrygian origin, austerity of, 38. Embraced by Tertullian, 39.

Montanus, i. 37.

Monte Casino, Benedict's convent at, i. 420. Besieged by Markwald, iv. 23.

Montferrat, Marquis of, joins Crusade at Zara, iv. 141. His treaty with Alexius, 142.

Montmirail, meeting at, iii. 498. Broken off, 499.

Monumental sculpture, vi. 601.

Morals of clergy, vi. 385.

Moravians, conversion of, ii. 425.

Moreale, Fra, v. 551. Executed by Rienzi, 552.

Morosini, Thomas, Venetian Patriarch of Constantinople, iv. 151. Confirmed by Innocent III., 155. Arrives at Constantinople—the Franks jealous of, 157.

Morrone, Peter. *See* Cœlestine V.

Mortmain, statute of, v. 182. Its objects, 183; vi. 34. A bulwark against Church, 100, 368.

Morville, Hugh de, iii. 519.

Mosaics, vi. 604, 609.

Moseilama, rival of Mohammed, slain by Khaled, ii. 36.

'*Mother* of God,' vi. 413.

Movements, intellectual, iii 346.

Muhldorf, battle of, v. 452.

Murder of Becket, iii. 522. Its effects, 523. Legality of, asserted by Jean Petit, vi. 218.

Muret, battle of, iv. 225.
Music, Church, improved by Gregory the Great, i. 440. In Anglo-Saxon church, ii. 97.
Mysteries, vi. 493. Dramatic—impressiveness of, 496. Symbolised in Gothic architecture, 593.
Mystery of Innocents, vi. 494.
Mysticism, iii. 379.
Mysticism and Scholasticism, vi. 439. In Germany, 554.

N.

Naples in league with Saracens, ii. 337. Frederick II.'s Constitution for, iv. 359. University of, 367. Claimants to crown of, v. 56. Discontent in against French, 73. Arrest of Templars in, 308. Rienzi interferes in affairs of, 523. War in, vi. 22.
Napoleon, Orsini, Cardinal, his complaint to Philip the Fair, v. 408.
Narni subdued by Innocent III., iv. 16.
Narses, Governor of Italy, i. 347. Disgraced—threatens revolt—his death, 348. Calls in Lombards, 427.
Nations, voting by, at Constance, vi. 181.
Nativity, St. Francis preaches on, iv. 270.
Navarre, affairs of, iv. 116.
Navas de Tolosa, battle of, iv. 112.
Nepotism of Gregory X., v. 100. Prevalence of, 398; vi. 36, 386.
Neronian persecution, i. 26.
Nestorian controversy, narrowness of its issue, i. 140. Referred to Pope Celestine I., 151.
Nestorianism promulgated at Constantinople, i. 142. Resistance to, 143. Proscribed by Imperial edict, 176. Its remarkable extension in the East, 177.
Nestorius, a Syrian, i. 141. His sermons at Constantinople, 142. His persecuting spirit, 143. Weakness of his position, 151. His letter to Pope Celestine I., 152. Condemned by Pope, 153. Strife with his opponents, 155. His influence at court, 156. Proceedings against at Council of Ephesus, 164. Retires to Antioch, 171. Exiled to the Oasis—his sufferings and death, 175.
Neuilly, Fulk of. *See* Fulk.
Nicea, 1st Council of, settles the Easter question, i. 36. Its high authority, 187. Its decrees misquoted by Zosimus, 188.
Nicea, second Council of, ii. 184. Its proceedings, 185; and decree in favour of image-worship, 186.
Nicean creed, vi. 286.
Nicephorus, Emperor, ii. 192.
Nicephorus Phocas, Eastern Emperor, ii. 473.
Nicolas I., Pope, entitled 'the Great,' ii. 345. His intervention at Constantinople and in France—its results, 346. Sends legates to Constantinople, 349. Supports Ignatius against Photius, 351. His contest with John Bishop of Ravenna, 358. Reduces him to submission, 359. Overawes Emperor Louis II., 366. Domineers over French prelates, 368; and over King Lothair, 369. His triumph and death, 372. His character—sanctions the False Decretals, 373. His answer to Bogoris, 422.
Nicolas II., iii. 48. Vests Papal elections in Cardinals, 49. His league with Normans, 53. His death, 54.
Nicolas III., his designs, v. 96. Extends Papal territories, 98. His nepotism and sudden death, 100. His intrigues against Charles of Anjou, 109.
Nicolas IV., v. 124. Annuls Charles the Lame's surrender of Sicily, 126. His death, 129. Persecutor of Roger Bacon, vi. 478.
Nicolas V. (Thomas of Sarzana), Papal legate at Frankfort, vi. 325. Elected Pope, 333. His prudent conduct, 334. His character, 337; and policy, 338. Holds Jubilee, 339. Crowns Frederick III., 343. Suppresses conspiracy, 345. His anxiety, 346. His death, 347. A patron of letters, 349. Founds Vatican Library, 350. Employs translators from Greek authors, 351. His design for St. Peter's, 353. Repairs churches and walls of Rome, 354. His buildings in Romagna, 355. His death-bed, 355. His papacy closed mediæval letters and art, 619. Begins new æra, 620. Encourages classical learning, 623.
Nicolas V. (Peter de Corvara), Antipope, v. 474. His abjuration, 479. Confined at Avignon—his death, 480.
Nicolas, Papal legate in England, iv. 100.
Nicolas of Basle, vi. 557.
Nitria, monks of, i. 147.
Nobility a ground for Papal dispensations, vi. 381.
'*Noble* Lesson' of the Waldenses, iv. 185.
Nobles, English, alarmed by Becket's pretensions, iii. 462.
Nogaret, William of, v. 248. His speech against Boniface VIII., 249. In Italy, 259. Altercation with Pope at Anagni, 262. Excepted from Papal pardon, 269. His protest, 281. Demands absolution, 282. His services to Philip the Fair, 283. Absolved by Clement V., 285. Accuses Templars, 293, 322. Prosecutes memory of Boniface VIII., 367. His pleadings, 369. His penance, 377.
Nominalists and Realists, iii. 354.
Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, jealous of Abélard, iii. 367.
Norbert, St., Bishop of Utrecht, iv. 180.
Norman conquest sanctioned by Pope, iii. 120. Latinising tendency of, vi. 533.
Norman architecture, vi. 583. Cathedrals, 584.
Normans in South Italy, iii. 33. Their victory over Leo IX., 35. Their league with Pope Nicolas II., 53. Sack and burn Rome, 197. Vassals of Pope, 325. Learned churchmen of, 436. In France, vi. 521. Become French, 522. In Italy, 522.
Northampton, Council of, iii. 469. Fines Becket, 470.
Northmen, ravages of, ii. 430. In France—in the Mediterranean—sack Luna, 431. In Germany, 432. Their religion, 433.
Northumberland, kingdom of, ii. 62. Becomes Christian, 64. Falls into heathenism, 66. Its re-conversion, 67.
Northumbrians accept Christianity, ii. 64.

Novatian, Antipope, i. 50.
Novatianism; its spread, and duration, i. 51.
Novatus opposes Cyprian, i. 48. Adheres to Novatian, i. 49.

O.

'*Obedience*' of rival Popes, vi. 65.
Oblations, vi. 374.
Ockham, William of, v. 441. His anti-papal writings, 467. Counsellor of Louis of Bavaria, 501. Of Merton College, vi. 103. A Franciscan, 450. Denies Papal authority, 471. His theology, 472, and philosophy, 473. His nominalism, 474.
Octavian. *See* John XII.
Octavian, Cardinal, Papal legate, iv. 71. At Soissons, 73.
Odo, Archbishop, his outrage upon King Edwy, iii. 114.
Odo, Duke of Burgundy, iii. 332.
Odo of Bayeux, half brother of William the Conqueror, iii. 438.
Odoacer, King of Italy, i. 225. His decree at election of Pope Felix, 236. Makes peace with Theodoric—his death, 293.
Odilo, abbot of Clugny, iii. 101.
Œcumenic councils. *See* Councils.
Oldcastle. *See* Cobham.
Oliva, John Peter, his prophecies, v. 420.
Olympius, favourite of Honorius, ruins Stilicho, i. 97.
Omar, Caliph, takes Jerusalem, ii. 41.
Orcagna, vi. 614.
Ordeal, i. 307; ii. 364. At Florence, iii. 91.
Orders, Mendicant. *See* Friars.
Orestes, prefect of Alexandria, endeavours to maintain peace, i. 146. His hostility to Cyril, 147.
Oriental manners, v. 289.
Orsini, feuds of at Rome, iv. 14, 16. House of, v. 99; vi. 53.
Orsini, Cardinal, at Conclave at Rome, vi. 7. His death, 15.
Osker, Norman chief, ii. 431.
Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy, i. 293. Its decline after Theodoric, 333. Laws, 379.
Oswald, in Northumberland, invites a bishop from Iona, ii. 66. In Wessex, 67. His death, 68.
Oswin murdered by Oswio, ii. 68.
Oswio, his victory over Penda—his power, ii. 68.
Otfried, vi. 532.
Otho I., the Great, Emperor—in Italy—marries Adelaide, ii. 465. Crowned at Rome, 467. John XII.'s plots against marches against Rome, 468. Quells insurrection in Rome, 470. His third expedition into Italy, 473. His death, 474.
Otho II., Emperor, prepares war against Saracens, dies at Rome, ii. 475.
Otho III., Emperor, ii. 476. Visits Rome, makes Gregory V. Pope—is crowned, and returns, 479. Invades Italy—his severities, 481. His great designs, 484. Enters the tomb of Charlemagne, 485. Appoints Gerbert Pope, 496. Visits Rome—poisoned by Stephania, 497.

Otho IV. in England, iv. 32. His claim to empire, 33. Crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, 35. Appeals to Innocent III., 36. Declared Emperor by Pope, 45. Proclaimed by legates, 46. His coronation at Rome, 54. In Tuscany, 55. Quarrels with Innocent III., 55. Excommunicated, 56. Rising against in Germany, 57. Returns to Germany, 59. Marries daughter of Emperor Philip, 59. Retires before Frederick II., 61. His penance and death, 288.
Otho, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, iii. 492.
Otho, Bishop of Bamberg, iii. 268.
Otho of Wittlesbach, murders King Philip, iv. 53.
Otho, Papal legate in England, iv. 309.
Otho, Duke of Bavaria, iv. 403. His fidelity to Emperor Frederick, 443.
Otto. *See* Urban II.
Ottobuoni, cardinal legate in England, v. 68. His sentences, 70. Constitutions of, 72.
Oxford, vi. 102. Wycliffite, 128.

P.

Paderborn, diet at, ii. 285.
Paganism, extinction of, i. 78, 103.
Pagans, dispersion of, i. 107.
Palæologus, Michael, Greek Emperor, v 89. Reconciles Greek and Roman churches, 90. Insurrection against, 97. Excommunicated—his death, 102. His intrigues against Charles of Anjou, 108.
Palæologus, John VI., vi. 266. Negotiates with Pope and Council of Basle, 267. Resolves on journey to Italy, 270. Embarks, 273. His reception at Venice, 275. Goes to Ferrara, 276. At Florence, 285. Returns to Constantinople, 293.
Palecz, accuser of Huss, vi. 201, 204. Entreats him to yield, 207.
Palermo, Archbishop of, iv. 454.
Palermo rises against French, v. 112.
Palestine, sacred places in, iii. 225. Affairs of, iv. 331.
Palestrina surrendered to Boniface VIII., v. 166.
Palmary Synod, i. 306. Acquits Symmachus, 307.
Pandulph, legate to King John, iv. 93. Dictates treaty, 94. Prohibits Philip's invasion of England, 97. In England, 104, 107.
Pandulph, Bishop of Norwich, iv. 308.
'*Pange* Lingua Gloriosi,' vi. 491.
Pantaleon, James. *See* Urban IV.
Pantheism of Erigena, iii. 352. Heresy of, vi. 415.
Painting, encouraged by Nicolas V., vi. 355. Christian, 603. Byzantine, 604. Devotional, 605. Cloistral school of, 616. Transalpine, 618.
Paintings, Byzantine, vi. 610. Wall, 613.
Papacy rises on decline of Empire, i. 89. Temporal power of, injurious to spiritual, 350. The life of Christianity, 429. Mediæval, its services to Europe, 430. Seized by Toto, ii. 249. Under Charlemagne, 277. State of, at Charlemagne's death, 308. Abase-

ment of (10th century), 446. Sale of, 506. Degradation of, iii. 3. Preserves Christianity, 97. Revival of, 98. Universal reverence for, 99. Relations of to Empire, 123. Its powers, 125. Strife with Empire terminated by Concordat of Worms, 321. Idea of, iv. 5. Causes of its strength, 7. Humility of its language, 8. Satires upon, 172. Venality of, 173; vi. 235. Last strife of with Empire, iv. 312. Vacancy of, 417; v. 82. 85, 409. Decline of, 220, 399. Vitality of, 275. Degradation of, 276. Strengthened by Council of Constance, vi. 231. Restored by Nicolas V., 352. Blindness of, 395. Public feeling impatient of, 621.

Papal authority strengthened by Crusades, iv. 6. Lofty claims of, v. 152.

Papal claims examined by Marsilio of Padua, v. 465.

Papal court, its jealousy of Rienzi, v. 528.

Papal elections, tumultuous character of, i. 134. Regulated by Emperors, 136. Anomaly in, ii. 446. Violence of, 448. Vested in Cardinals, iii. 49. Regulated at Council of Lyons, v. 92.

Papal extortions, vi. 81.

Papal legates, ii. 369.

Papal power, based on Friars' orders, iv. 405, 426. Controversy on, v. 442. Decline of, vi. 99, 332.

Papal prerogative, growth of, vi. 225.

Papal revenues, failure of, vi. 33. From England, 96.

Papal schism. *See* Schism.

Paper, manufacture of, vi. 625.

Paraclete, the, founded by Abélard, iii. 367. Occupied by Heloisa and nuns, 369.

Paraphrases, vi. 486.

Parental power under Justinian, i. 363. Was never absolute in practice, 370. Limitations of, 370, 371.

Paris, University of, v. 42. Its contest with citizens, 43. Dispute with Dominicans, 44, 48, 51. Takes part with Philip the Fair, 257. Condemns Papal schism, vi. 37. Circular letters of, 43. Resists Friars, 78. Looked up to by Schoolmen, 450.

Parish Priest, Chaucer's, vi. 549.

Parliament (of Westminster), iii. 462. Development of, v. 173. At Bury, 190. Of Lincoln, 217. Petitions against hierarchy, vi. 108. Resists Papal exactions, 111. 'The Good,' 115. Strife in, 145.

Parliament (French), v. 234. Addresses Pope and Cardinals, 235. At the Louvre, 248. Second meeting of, 252. At Tours, 310. Condemns Templars, 311.

Parliaments in kingdom of Naples, iv. 364.

Parma taken by Papalists, iv. 446. Repulses Frederick II., 447. Expulsion of inquisitors from, v. 425.

Parma, John of, General of Franciscans, v. 48.

Paschal I., Pope, ii. 315. Charge against, 322. His death, 323.

Paschal II., Pope, iii. 261. Not acknowledged—strife with Henry IV., 267. Absolves Prince Henry, 271. His relations with Henry V., 278. At Guastalla—invited into Germany, 279. His treaty with Henry V., 284. His

suspicion and insincerity, 287. Imprisoned, 289. His treaty with Henry, 291. Crowns him, 292. His clergy remonstrate, 293. His embarrassment, 294. His treaty annulled, 295. Confirms excommunication of Henry V., 301. Quarrels with Roman people, 302. Retires before Henry V., 303. His death, 304. Buried in the Lateran, 305.

Paschal III., Imperialist Pope, iii. 433. In Rome, 532. Accompanies Frederick Barbarossa to Rome, 532.

Pastoureaux, the, v. 35. Their progress and hostility to clergy, 38. In Paris—at Orleans, 39. In Bourges, Bordeaux, and Marseilles, 40. Suppressed, 41. Second outbreak of, 441. Persecute the Jews, 445.

Paterines, iii. 63. Term applied to Manichæans, iv. 189.

Patripassianism, i. 41. *See* Monarchianism.

Pavia burnt by Hungarians, ii. 445. Council of, decides for Victor IV., iii. 430. Council of, vi. 239.

Paul, St., hatred of, shown in the Clementina, i. 34.

Paul's, St., Council in, v. 71. Disturbance in, 118. Gifts to, 375.

Paul, Pope, ii. 246. His adulation of Pepin, 247. Fear of the Greeks, 248. Pontificate peaceful, 249.

Paul, Bishop of Emesa, negotiates peace with Cyril, i. 173.

Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 129, 181. His declaration in favour of image-worship, and death, 183.

Paulicians, iv. 187. Persecutions of, under Theodora—in Bulgaria, 188.

Paulinus converts King Edwin, ii. 63. Converts Northumbrians, 64. Bishop of York, 65. His flight into Kent, 66

Peace of Germany, iii. 266. Irksome to the nobles, 269.

Peada, son of Penda, conversion of, ii. 69.

Peasants under Frederick II., iv. 363.

Pedro of Arragon makes kingdom feudatory to Pope, iv. 117. His marriage and journey to Rome, 118. In Albigensian war, 219. Protects Count Raymond, 223. His appeal to Pope Innocent III., 224. Slain at Muret, 225.

Pelagian controversy, i. 110. Origin of, in human nature, 113.

Pelagianism, an element of all religious systems, i. 116. Indifference to, in the East, 137.

Pelagius a Briton, i. 110. In Rome, Africa, and Palestine—acquitted of heresy—opposed by Augustine, and by Jerome, 111. Declared orthodox by Pope Zosimus, 123. Declaration retracted, 125.

Pelagius I., Pope, his previous history, i. 344. Sent by Totila to Constantinople—made Pope, 345. Accused of plotting against Vigilius—regarded with suspicion, 346. Supported by Narses—his death, 347.

Pelagius II., Pope, i. 348.

Penance at Canosa, iii. 167. Of Henry II., 525. Of St. Louis, v. 6.

Penda, his victory over Edwin, ii. 66. Over Oswald, 68. Defeated and slain by Oswio, 69.

Penitential system, i. 404, 406. Advantages of, 407.

Pepin the Short, unites France, ii. 225. Elected King, 235. Teutonises French monarchy, 238. Anointed by Pope Stephen, 241. Invades Italy, 242. Second invasion of Italy, 245. His success, 246. Entitled 'Patrician of Rome,' 247.

Pepin, son of Louis the Pious, his successful rebellion, ii. 326. Submits to his father, 328. Rebells again, 330. Dies, 337.

Pepin, Count, in Rome, v. 534.

'*Perils* of the last times,' burned before Alexander IV., v. 49.

Persecution by Nero and Domitian, i. 26. Under Trajan in the East, 27. By Maximin, 47. By Decius, 47. Of pilgrims, iii. 227. Of heretics in Languedoc, v. 16. In France, 20.

Persia, war with, ii. 4. Mohammedan conquest of, 43.

Perugia, Boniface IX. in, vi. 39. Tumults in, 39. Abandoned by Pope, 40. Conclave at, v. 276.

Peter, St., the leading person of the Clementina, i. 33, 34. Roman claim of descent from, 83.

Peter's, St., Rome, contest for, iii. 207. New cathedral, design for, vi. 353.

Peter the Fuller, his intrigues at Antioch, i. 228, 232. Agrees to the Henoticon, 233. Excommunicated by Pope Felix, 237.

Peter the Stammerer, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 232.

Peter the Archdeacon, remarkable death of, i. 464.

Peter, Bishop of Florence, iii. 89.

Peter the Hermit, iii. 230. *His* preaching and influence, 231. In Germany, 263.

Peter, son of Leo, his influence over Paschal II., iii. 283. His part in treaty with Henry V., 285.

Peter of Blois, his account of death of Urban III., iii. 542. Efforts for King Richard's liberation, 548.

Peter, King of Hungary, dethroned, iii. 30.

Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, protects Abelard, iii. 376. Refutes Peter de Brueys, iv. 76.

Peter of Capua, legate in France, iv. 66. Declares Interdict, 67. Papal legate to Crusaders at Zara, 143. Recalled by Innocent III., 158.

Peter de Castelnau, Legate to Provence, iv. 195, 199. Excommunicates Count Raymond, 200. Murdered, 201. His murder ascribed to Count Raymond, 202.

Peter, Monk of Vaux Cernay, his history of Albigensian war, iv. 203.

Peter of Arragon, v. 107. Prepares for war, 108. His secresy, 110. Arrives in Sicily, 116. His embassy to Charles of Anjou, 117. Agrees to single combat, 118. At Bordeaux, 120. His death, 123.

Peter Lombard, 'Sentences' of, vi. 438.

Peter's pence, iii. 481; iv. 307.

Petra, conquered by Rome, ii. 7.

Petrarch, 'de vitâ solitariâ,' v. 140. At Avignon, 501. His opinion of Rienzi, 543. His expostulation to Urban V., 559. Religion of, vi. 516.

Petrobussians, iv. 175.

Peyraud, Hugh de, v. 319.

Philagathus, a Greek—Antipope, ii. 480. Cruel treatment of by Otho III., 481.

Philip I. of France, charges against by Gregory VIII., iii. 120. His character, 220. Excommunicated, 221.

Philip Augustus, his crusade, iii. 545. Takes part with Emperor Philip, iv. 35. Marries Ingeburga of Denmark, 63. His aversion to her, 64. Marries Agnes of Meran, 65. His peace with England, 66. His rage at Interdict, 69. Compelled to submit, 71. Acknowledges Ingeburga, 72. Treats her with neglect—supports Prince Arthur of England, 77. Abandons his cause, 79. Summons John of England to do homage, 79. Makes war on John, 80. Takes Normandy, 81. Undertakes to dethrone King John, 91. Forbidden to proceed by Pope—his rage, 97. Establishes college for Greeks at Paris, 156. Approves crusade against Provençal heretics, 204. His jealousy of Simon de Montfort, 223, 227. Death of, v. 122.

Philip the Fair, v. 153. Compared with Edward I., 176. His policy, 178. Deludes Edward I., 179. His rapacity, 186. Exactions from Jews and bankers, 187. From nobles, 188. Taxes clergy, 189. Resists Pope, 194. Detains daughter of Count of Flanders, 195. Bull of Boniface VIII. against, 196. His reply, 198-200. His war with England, 201. Successes in Flanders, 202. Willingness for peace, 203. Treaty with Edward I., 204. Abandons Scots—his quarrel with Pope, 220. Its grounds, 221. Dissatisfied with Papal arbitration, 222. Alliance with Albert of Austria, 223. Arraigns and imprisons Papal Legate, 227. His reply to Lesser Bull, 231. Burns Greater Bull, 234. Condemns the Inquisition, 243. His reply to Pope, 247. Excommunicated—holds Parliament at the Louvre, 248. His 'Ordinance of Reformation,' 249. Seizes Papal despatches, 251. Appeals to General Council, 255. Second excommunication of, 259. His embassy to Benedict XI.—obtains absolution, 268. Persecutes memory of Boniface VIII.—his embassy to Cardinals, 270. Secret compact with Clement V., 278. Insists on condemnation of Boniface, 280. His expedients for raising money, 282. His reception of Du Molay, 292. Arrests the Templars, 297. His further proceedings against them, 298. Sends message to England, 306. Seeks empire for his brother Charles, 309. Calls on Pope to condemn Templars, 311. Responsible for proceedings against Templars, 356. Contemporary testimony against, 359. Disappointed of spoils, 360. Urges proceedings against memory of Boniface VIII., 365. Refuses to prosecute before Pope, 366. Abandons prosecution, 375. Burns Du Molay, 397. His death—disasters of his last years—his poverty, 400. Conduct of *his* daughters-in-law, 401. His death, 402. His sons, 412.

Philip de Valois, proposes crusade against Moors, v. 482. His estrangement from John XXII., 484. Resolves on crusade, 491. Pre-

PHILIP.

vents Pope's reconciliation with Empire, 493. Intercedes for Louis of Bavaria, 496.

Philip the Long, King of France, v. 412. Disturbances in his reign, 444.

Philip the Hohenstaufen, his claim to Empire, iv. 31. His negotiation with Innocent III., 34. Crowned at Mentz, 35. His address to Innocent III., 37. His adherents, 38. Innocent declares against him, 43. Holds Diet at Bamberg, 46. Acknowledged by Innocent III., 52. Murdered, 53. His ambassadors to crusaders in behalf of Alexius, 141.

Philip, Duke of Burgundy, vi. 327.

Philip, elected Pope by a faction, ii. 250.

Philosophy, foreign to Mohammedanism, vi 441. Aristotelian, 443. Arabian, 448.

Philorenus. *See* Xenaras.

Phocas, his usurpation, i. 460. His character, 461.

Photius, his learning, ii. 347. Appointed Patriarch of Constantinople—his contest with Ignatius, 348. His letters to Nicolas I., 348, 351. Decree of Nicolas against, 351. Holds Council at Constantinople, 354. Deposed by Emperor Basil, 355. Condemned at Council of Constantinople, 356. His restoration, second deposition, and death, 357.

Physical science, prejudice against, vi. 359.

Piacenza, Council of, iii. 215. Great assemblage, 216. Receives charges against Henry IV.—its decrees, 217. First mention of crusade coldly received, 219.

Piccolomini, family of, vi. 306.

Pictures of Saints, ii. 151. Argument in favour of, 152. Allegorical, v. 519.

Piers Ploughman's Vision, vi. 536. Poetry of, 537. On wealth of Clergy, 538. Against Mendicants, 539. On Clergy—politics of, 540. Allegory of, 541. The Vision, 542. Its moral, 543. Probably unfinished, 544.

Pilgrimage, opinions of the Fathers upon, iii. 222. Growing tendency to, 224. Commerce of, 225. Continued under Mohammedan rule, 226. Dangers of, 227.

Pilgrims at Rome, plundered, ii. 507. Persecuted by Turks, iii. 228. To Rome, v. 209.

Pisa, the Papal city under Innocent II., iii. 341. Cathedral of—Council of, vi. 68. Its proceedings, 70. Deposes rival Popes, 71. Elects Alexander V., 74. Architecture of, 582.

Pisano, Nicolo, sculptor and architect, vi. 601.

Pius II. *See* Æneas Sylvius, vi. 348.

Plague at Rome, i. 437. At Avignon, v. 536. At Ferrara, vi. 279. At Basle, 299, 316.

Plasian, William of, his charges against Boniface VIII., v. 252. His advice to Du Molay, 320. Prosecutor of memory of Boniface VIII., 367.

Pluralities, vi. 381.

Poetry, Provençal, iv. 191; vi. 509. Of St. Francis, iv. 269. Vernacular, 247. Early Italian, 319. Parisian vulgar, v. 50. Christian Latin, vi. 486. Scriptural, 487. Historical—Latin, 488. Lyric, 498. Crusading—Satiric, 501. Italian, 509, 510. Romance, 525. Rise of English, 535.

PROCESSION.

Poggio Bracciolini, vi. 216, 350.

Poitiers, Clement V. at, v. 305, 311.

Pollentia, battle of, i. 94.

Polychronius at Constantinople, ii. 137.

Pongilupo of Ferrara, v. 423.

Ponsard de Gisi undertakes defence of Templars, v. 320. Tortured, 321.

Pontianus, Pope, banished to Sardinia—martyrdom of, i. 47.

Pontificate, Roman, the centre of Latin Christianity, i. 18.

Pontigny, Cistercian monastery, iii. 481. Becket's retirement there, 482.

Poor men of Lyons, iv. 175, 182. Condemned by Lucius III., 183. Their doctrines, 184.

Popes, early, their names nearly all Greek, i. 22. Traditions about them worthless, 23. Their obscurity, real dignity, and power, 25, 26. Danger of their post, 31. Subject to Eastern Emperor, 348; ii. 119. Their policy destructive to Italy, i. 349, 350. List of, from Gregory I. to Gregory II., ii. 118. Temporal power of, 217. Rapid succession of (9th century), 415. Their part in Imperial elections, 448. Three rival, 507. All degraded by Henry III., 508. Gain power from Crusades, iii. 242. Keep aloof from Crusades, 243. Their legates, 245. Victory over Empire, 538. Avarice of, iv. 307; vi. 36. Alliance with Friars, v. 41. Rapid succession of, 94. Favour France against England, 558. Rival, vi. 17. Their mutual distrust, 64. Deposed at Pisa, 71. Taxation by, 377. Satires on, 503. Opposition to, in Germany, 551. Originators of houses, 620.

Porcaro, Stephen, vi. 344. His conspiracy and death, 345.

Porto, Cardinal of, his speech to Consistory, v. 239.

Portugal, relations of to Papacy, iv. 113.

Portus, its situation and bishopric, i. 42.

'*Possessioners*,' vi. 136.

Poyet, Bernard de, Cardinal, reputed son of John XXII., legate to Lombardy, v. 450. At Bologna, 483.

Præmunire, Statute of, vi. 100, 237.

Pragmatic Sanction, v. 23, 83; vi. 282, 339.

Prague, Rienzi at, v. 537. University of, vi. 166. Articles of, 248.

Praxeas the heresiarch, i. 39.

'*Preachers*' founded by St. Dominic, iv. 254.

Preaching, disuse of, iv. 242. Was the strength of heresies, 245.

Prebendaries, vi. 373.

Predestination, doctrine of, opposed to hierarchy, iii. 349.

Preferment, Papal right of, vi. 226.

Presence, Real, Erigena's definition of, iii. 23.

Priesthood of Teutons, i. 262. Power of, vi. 394. Its loss of power, 627. Its claims, 630.

Priests, haughtiness of, ii. 578.

Primogeniture, ii. 318.

Printing, vi. 625.

Priscillian, put to death by Maximus, i. 196.

Priscillianites in Spain, i. 197.

Procession of Holy Ghost, vi. 286, 291, 398.

Procida, John of, v. 104. His intrigues, 108.
Proclus preaches against Nestorius, i. 144. Bishop of Constantinople, 175.
Procopius, vi. 247, 249. His victories, 250.
Procurations, iv. 399.
Progress of intellect, vi. 621.
Prohibited degrees of marriage—extended to spiritual relationship, i. 365.
Prophecies, Franciscan, v. 417, 421.
Prophetesses, Teutonic, i. 263.
Property, law of, as affecting the church, i. 372.
Prosper, a partisan of Augustine, i. 130. His poem, 131.
Proterius, murder of, i. 228.
Provençal poetry, iv. 191; vi. 509. Clergy, iv. 192. Language, 247.
Provence, subject to kings of Naples, v. 407.
Provisions, vi. 225.
Provisors, statute of, vi. 33, 100. Re-enacted, 111.
Prudentius, vi. 491.
Prussia, paganism in, v. 404. Subject to Teutonic knights, 405.
Ptolemais, Frederick II. at, iv. 333.
'*Publicans*,' doctrines of, iv. 180. Burnt as heretics, 181.
Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II., i. 170. Ruins Nestorius, 171. Empress—marries Marcian, 207. Her death, 210.
Purgatory, growth of belief in, vi. 428. Visions and legends of, 430.
Pyrrhus, Bishop of Constantinople, flies to Africa, ii. 128. At Rome—his monotheletism, 129. Anathematised by Pope Theodorus, 130.

Q.

Questions. *See* Controversies.
Quinisextan Council, ii. 140.
Quod-vult-Deus, Bishop of Carthage, banished to Italy by Genseric, i. 190.

R.

Races of Europe, vi. 534.
Rachis, a Lombard king, attacks Perugia, ii. 232. Becomes monk, 233. Re-appears, 246.
Rainieri, Bishop, his war against Dolcinites, v. 431.
Rainer, Papal Legate in Spain, iv. 113, 116.
Randulph de Broc, an enemy of Becket, iii. 516, 519.
Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, ii. 461.
Rationalism of Erigena, iii. 352.
Ratisbon, Diet at, v. 459.
Ravenna, monument of Theodoric at, i. 327. Exarchs of, their weakness, ii. 204. Tumults in—taken by Liutprand, 207. Retaken, 208. Parties in, 209. Ceded to Roman Church by Rudolph of Hapsburg, v. 97. Decline of, vi. 388. Churches of, 571.
Raymond, Count of Toulouse, iv. 198. His difficult position, 199. Excommunicated, 200. Charged with murder of Papal legate, 202. Excommunicated by Pope, 203. His submission and penance, 206. Compelled to join crusade—continued persecution of, 211. His journey to Rome, 214. New demands upon, 218. Takes up arms, 219. His contest in Toulouse with Bishop, 220. Defeated at Muret, 225. His submission—puts to death his brother, 226. Withdraws to England, 227. Deposed by Lateran Council, 228. Appears before the Pope, 229. Recovers Toulouse, 235. His death—his body refused burial, 236.
Raymond VII. (the younger) of Toulouse, flies to England, iv. 227. At Rome, 229. Under protection of Innocent III., 233. His war with De Montfort, 233. Treaty with St. Louis, 237. Penance, 238. Rises against Louis IX., v. 19. Forced to submit, 20.
Raymond de Pennaforte, iv. 371.
Realists and Nominalists, iii. 354.
Reason, limits of, vi. 465.
Recared, Catholic King of Spain, i. 447.
"*Reformation*, Ordinance of," v. 249.
Reformation, causes of, vi. 396. Demand for, 561.
Reforms of Benedict XII., v. 497.
'*Refutation* of all Heresies,' Hippolytus its probable author, i. 42.
Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 484. His death, 494.
Reliques, i. 470. Tales of their efficacy, 471. Supply of, from Palestine, iii. 225. Plunder of at Constantinople, iv. 149. Veneration of St. Louis for, v. 8. Brought into hall of council at Basle, vi. 298. Veneration for, 423. Wars respecting, 424.
Religion, popular, vi. 400. Various elements of, 629.
Religious wars in Gaul, i. 278. Origin of, ii. 49. Established by Crusades, iii. 247. Their subsequent prevalence, 250.
Remi, St. church of, consecrated, iii. 14. Sanctity of, vi. 419.
Remigius, baptizes Clovis, i. 276. His remains removed, iii. 14.
'*Renardus* Vulpes,' vi. 490.
Republic in Rome, iii. 391, 395. Its end, 410. Under Rienzi, v. 522.
Republics, Italian, extinct, vi. 620.
Reservations, vi. 225.
Reserves, Papal, v. 486.
Revival of Letters, vi. 621, 623.
Revolution in Rome, v. 518. Omens of, vi. 621, 623.
Rhadagaisus invades Italy, i. 95. His defeat and death, 96.
Rheims, wealth and importance of, i. 292.
Rheims, Council of, deposes Arnulf, ii. 491. Council of, iii. 14. Its decrees, 17. Council of, 311.
Rhythms, the, vi. 492.
Richard, Court of Ancona, his cruel death, iii. 552.
Richard Cœur de Lion, iii. 545. His imprisonment, 548. Protects Otho, iv. 32. Makes peace with France, 66. His alliance with Innocent III., 76. His death, 77.
Richard II., his accession, vi. 119.
Richard of Cornwall elected Emperor, v. 30. His death, 88.
Rienzi, at Avignon, v. 501, 513. His story

of his birth, 510. His early history, 512. His letter to Rome, 513. His poverty, 514. Complains of state of Rome, 515. His dissimulation, 516. His allegorical pictures, 517. Revolutionises Rome, 518. Laws of, 519. Describes his success, 520. His justice, 521. Power, 522. Titles, 523. Respect for the Church, 524. The height of his power, 525. His proclamation and coronation, 526. Prophecy of his fall, 527. His ostentation, 528. Arrests the nobles—restores them, 530. His victory over Colonnas, 531. His despondency, 532. Denounced by Pope, 533. His abdication, 534. Flight, and retreat among the Fraticelli, 535. Goes to Prague, 537. His interviews with Charles IV., 538. Imprisoned—letter of, 539. Letter to Archbishop of Prague, 540. Doubtful motives, 542. Sent prisoner to Avignon—Petrarch's opinion of, 543. His trial and imprisonment, 544. Sent to Rome, 550. Made Senator, 551. His capricious rule and murder, 552.

Ripuarian law, i. 380.

Ripon, church at, ii. 80.

Ritual, iv. 242.

'*Robber* Synod.' *See* Ephesus.

Robert, King of France, his submission to the Church, iii. 119.

Robert of France, Pope Gregory offers Imperial crown to, iv. 401.

Robert, King of Naples, v. 389. Vicar of Italy, 450. Besieges Ostia, 476.

Rodolf the Norman, ii. 503.

Rodolph of Hapsburg elected Emperor, v. 89. His gifts to Roman church, 97.

Roger, King of Sicily, upholds Anacletus II., iii. 339. His wars with Innocent II., 345.

Roger, Archbishop of York, an enemy of Becket, iii. 447. Made Papal Legate, 467. At Northampton, 472. Ambassador to Louis VII., 476. To Pope Alexander, 478. Crowns Prince Henry, 510. Suspended by Pope, 514. Justifies murder of Becket, 523.

Roland, a priest, delivers to Pope Gregory VII. Henry IV.'s letter, iii. 152.

Romagna, tranquillity of under Nicolas V., vi. 338.

Roman Bishop, obscurity of, i. 57. Absence of from Councils, 60, 62. Greatness after restoration of Rome, 108. Imperial character of, 109. Indifferent to destruction of Western Empire, 226.

Roman buildings restored by Theodoric, i. 299.

Roman Christians, their wealth and bounty, i. 27.

Roman church, its importance, i. 30. The centre of Christendom, and of all controversies, 31. Centre of heresies, 32. Discord in, 37. Composition of, 42. Intercourse with Carthage, 47. Subsequent dispute, 52. Supremacy of, acknowledged by Cyprian, 52. Head of Western churches, 59. Free from speculative discord, 60. Supports Athanasius, 61. In decline of Empire, 81. Veneration for, 82. Growth of its supremacy, 83, 84. Silent aggression of, 85. Appeals to, 88, 89. Appealed to on Pelagian question, 120. Wherein its power consisted, 121. Strengthened by Eastern contentions, 152. Its supremacy over Illyricum, 198. Causes of its strength, 212. Remains—sole government of Rome, 219. Power of in absence of Emperor, 344. Organization of, 439. Its estates, 441. Value of its property, 443. Influence of in England, ii. 73. Denounced by Franciscan prophets, v. 420, 422, 428. *See* Papacy.

Roman conquest of Petra, ii. 7.

Roman demagogues, vi. 343.

Roman dominion of Gaul, vi. 519.

Roman Empire, division of, i. 58. State of at accession of Leo the Great, 181.

Roman law affected by Christianity, i. 351. Required consolidation, 354. Attempts to organize, 355. Recognises slavery, 360.

Roman life, curious picture of, i. 44.

Roman morals, their corrupt state—Teutonic influence on, i. 283.

Roman people, character of, v. 527.

Roman power revives under Justinian, i. 328.

Roman supremacy, question of, i. 233.

Roman territory, depredations of nobles in, ii. 396.

Romance of the Rose, v. 50.

Romance poetry, vi. 525. Languages, 527.

Romanesque architecture, vi. 580. Transalpine, 583.

Romans welcome Belisarius, i. 337. Defeats of by Mohammedans, ii. 37. Faithful to Gregory VII., iii. 192. Venality of, 195. Surrender, 196. Rise against Normans, 197. Rise against Germans, 289. Their war with Henry V., 230. Quarrel with Paschal II., 302. Rise against Innocent II.—invite Emperor Conrad, 391. Defend Rome against Lucius II., 393. Embassy to Frederick Barbarossa, 414. Defeated by troops of Frederick, 531. Their rebellion and insolence, 531. Procure destruction of Tusculum, 547. Rise against Otho IV., iv. 55. Against Gregory IX., 331. Fickleness of—their enmity to Viterbo, 376. Rebel against Gregory IX., 378. Submit, 379. Raise tumult—suppressed by Frederick Barbarossa, 416. Demand a Roman Pope, vi. 5.

Rome, the church in, was originally Greek, i. 27. Influence of the name of, 86. Siege of by Alaric, 98. Capitulates, 99. Admits Attalus, 100. Third siege of, and capture, 101. Sack of, 102. Mitigated by Christianity, 103-105. Remains Christian—restoration of, 107. Destruction of was partial—capture of tended to Papal greatness, 108. Rumoured conspiracies in, 317. Second capture by Goths, 345. Ecclesiastical supremacy of, 400. Appeals to, 401. Plague and famine at, 437. State of, at Gregory's accession, 453. Ingratitude of to Gregory, 464. Councils at, condemn Iconoclasm, ii. 211-213. Anarchy and cruelties in, 250. Unsettled state of, 447. Attempted republicanism in, 472, 475. Papal, turbulence of, 309, 314. Threatened by Saracens, 394. Siege of, by Henry IV., iii. 192. Surrendered, 196. Surprised and burnt by Normans, 197. Republic in, 391, 395. Its end, 410. Placed under Interdict, 410. Venality of, 531. Pestilence at, 533. State of at accession of

Innocent III.—submission of, iv. 13. Feuds in, 14. War with Viterbo, 15. Anarchy in, 17. Rapacity of, 131. Takes part of Conradin, v. 76. Dante on Imperial destiny of, 393. Deserted by Popes, 408, 509. Calls on John XXII. to return, 469. Admits Louis of Bavaria, 470. Rienzi's revolution in, 518. Submits to Pope, 553. Its increasing estrangement, 557. Return of Pope to, 560. Tumultuous conclave at, vi. 4. Proceedings in, 6, 7. Disturbances in, 40, 54. Council of (John XXIII.)—incident at, 85. Pillaged by Neapolitans, 88. Miserable condition of (Martin V.), 234. Rises against Eugenius IV., 261. Centre of art and letters, 352. Architecture of, 567. Churches of, 568. Christian architecture unknown in, 619.

Roscelin, Nominalistic doctrines of, iii. 355.

Rose, the Golden, vi. 185.

Rotharis, i. 380.

Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, ii. 378. Appeals against Hincmar, 379.

Rudolf III. of Burgundy, ii. 504.

Rudolf of Swabia, rival of Henry IV., iii. 176. Elected—crowned at Mentz, 178. Low state of his affairs, 185. Acknowledged king by Pope, 187. His death, 190.

Rule of St. Francis, iv. 275.

Russian prelates at Florence, vi. 286.

Rustand, legate in England, v. 26.

S.

Saar, battle of, vi. 247.

Sabellius, i. 41.

Sabinianus, Pope, accuses Gregory I. of waste, ii. 118, and of Iconoclasm, 120. His death, 121.

Sacerdotal Hierarchy, vi. 405.

Sagarelli, Gerard, of Parma, his imitation of the Apostles, v. 424. His extravagances, 425. Burnt—strange account of, 426.

Saints, their protecting power, i. 470. Belief in, vi. 412. Deification of, 413. Calendar of, 416; of the East and West, 417. General and local, 419. National, 420. Festivals of —legends of, 421. Lives of, versified, 490. Buildings in honour of, 577.

Saisset, Papal legate in France, character of, v. 225. Arraigned, 227. Imprisoned, 228.

Saladin, iii. 543.

Salerno betrays Empress Constantia, iii. 548. Punished by Henry VI., 549.

Salic law, i. 381; v. 412.

Salisbury, John of, vi. 440.

Salvian on chastity of the Teutons, i. 285.

Sancho, King of Navarre, iv. 116.

Sanction, Pragmatic. *See* Pragmatic Sanction.

Sta. Sophia, Church of, vi. 570.

Saracen ladies in Court of Frederick II., iv. 319.

Saracens defeated by Leo the Armenian, ii. 192. Wars of with Theophilus, 200. Chivalry, 256. Invade Italy, 342. Threaten Rome, 394. Dread of, 395. Their stronghold on the Garigliano, 453. Driven out by Pope John X., 455. In South Italy, iii. 33.

Chivalry of, 256. In Sicily, iv. 25. At Capua, 353. In Manfred's service, v. 61.

Sardica, Council of, i. 62. Establishes appeals to Rome, 88.

Sardinia recovered from Saracens, ii. 503. Affairs of, iv. 410.

Sarzana, Thomas of. *See* Nicolas V.

Satiric poetry, monkish, vi. 501. Earnestness of, 502.

Sautree, William, Wycliffite martyr, vi. 144.

Savona, meeting of rival Popes appointed at, vi. 56. Delays regarding, 60.

Saxon wars of Charlemagne, ii. 280, 282. Their bloody character, 284. Were religious wars, 286. Prisoners, escape of, iii. 159.

Saxons, severe laws of against unchastity, i. 392. Their country, ii. 280. Their enmity to the Franks, 281. Bad reception of missionaries, 282. Resistance to Charlemagne, 284. Compulsory conversion, 287. Revolt against Henry IV., iii. 130. Their declaration, 130. Defeated at Hohenburg, 131. Their sacrilege at Hartzburg, 133. Their treaty with Henry V., 318.

Shinko, Archbishop of Prague, resists Huss, vi. 165. Burns Wycliffe's books, 167.

Schaffhausen, Pope John XXIII. at, vi. 191.

Schism of forty years, i. 233. Its close, 314.

Schism, Papal, iii. 69, 430; vi. 15. Terminated, iii. 537. Persecutions during, vi. 30. Attempts to terminate, 37, 42. Sentence of Council of Pisa on, 72. Indifference to, 303.

Schlick, Gaspar, vi. 320.

Scholasticism, vi. 435. Latin, 436, and Mysticism, 439. Great era of, 449. Unprofitableness, 452. Tendency to Pantheism, 468. Its duration, 481.

Schoolmen, v. 51; vi. 436. Five great, 449. All Mendicants, 450. Their titles, 451.

Schools at Athens suppressed by Justinian, i. 331. Monastery, iii. 353. English, vi. 100.

Scolastica, St., sister of Benedict, i. 417. Her death, 423.

Scotists and Thomists, vi. 469.

Scotland, resists Edward I., v. 203. Appeals to Pope, 205. Claimed as fief by Pope, 206. Claims of England upon, 218. Arrest of Templars in, 341, their examination, 351. Æneas Sylvius' account of, vi. 309.

Scots, reply to claims of Edward I., v. 219. Abandoned by Pope and French King, 220.

Scott, Michael, vi. 446.

Scotti, their feuds at Rome, iv. 14, 16.

Scottish clergy, their dispute with Romans, ii. 71.

Scotus, John. *See* Duns Scotus.

Sculpture, advance of under Nicolas V., vi. 355. Christian, 595. Rare in the East, 596. Proscribed in Greek Church, 597. Christian, in the West, 598. Architectural, 599. Rudeness of, 600. Monumental, 601. In wood, 608.

Sectarianism, time of Innocent III., iv. 169. Its principle of union, 170.

Sects in early Christendom, iii. 20.

Secular clergy, strife of with monks, iii.

SELJUKIANS.

78, 117. Their resistance to Dunstan, 116. (France), dispute with Friars, v. 52.

Seljukians. *See* Turks.

Semi-Pelagian controversy, conducted with moderation, i. 132.

Semi-Pelagianism, i. 125. Revives in Gaul under Cassianus, 128. Doctrines of, 131.

Senatorship of Rome, v. 99.

Sens, Council of, iii. 371.

'*Sentences*' of Peter Lombard, vi. 438.

Serena, widow of Stilicho, put to death, i. 98.

Serfdom, iv. 363.

Sergius, Bishop of Constantinople, starts the question of Monothelitism, ii. 123. Pope, 139. Rejects Quinisextan Council — his death, 140. Pope, 340.

Sergius IV., takes refuge in Tuscany, ii. 449. Deposes Christopher and becomes Pope, 450. Obscurity of his Papacy—alleged vices, 451. Tusculan Pope, 500.

Sergius, Duke of Naples, his league with Saracens, ii. 397. Betrayed—his miserable death, 398.

Serpent, symbol of Satan, vi. 416.

Services, Greek and Latin, difference of, vi. 573.

Serverus, Pope, condemns Monotheletism, ii. 126.

Severus, his riots in Constantinople, i. 243. Made Bishop of Antioch, 245. Degraded, 314.

Sewal, Archbishop of York, v. 26.

Sforza, Ludovico, vi. 233.

Sforza, Francis, vi. 336., Duke of Milan, 337.

Shepherds, French insurgents. *See* Pastoureaux.

'*Sic et Non*' of Abélard, iii. 380.

Sicilian exiles, v. 107. Vespers, 111.

Sicilians excluded from Jubilee, v. 210.

Sicily, Oriental manners in, iv. 319. Discontent of against French, v. 104. Insurrection in, 112. Crusade proclaimed against, 114. Affairs of (time of Boniface VIII.), 155. Resolute independence of, 157. War of, 158. Italian language in, vi. 512. Kingdom of, *See* Naples.

Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, iii. 134. Calls synod at Erfurt, 136. His flight, 137. Calls synod at Mentz—intimidated, 141.

Siegfried, Papal Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 48. Publishes excommunication of Otho IV., 57.

Sienna, vi. 341.

Sienna, Council at, vi. 240. Æneas Silvius, Bishop of, 341.

Sigismund, Emperor, character of, vi. 89. Interview with John XXIII., 91. Invites Huss to Constance, 168. Arrives at Constance, 172. His poverty, 173. Abandons Huss, 177. Excuses for, 178. Detains Pope, 186. Interview with Pope, 187. His embarrassment in the matter of Huss, 200. His declaration against Huss, 206. His apology to Bohemians, 213. His contest with Cardinals, 222. Takes leave of Council of Constance, 230. Succeeds to Bohemian crown, 246. Insurrection and war against, 247. Negotiates with Bohemians, 250. His progress through Italy, 256. At Sienna—his

SPIRITUALISTS.

coronation, 258. At Council of Basle, 259. Decline of his power, 262. His death, 281.

Silverius, Pope, son of Hormisdas, i. 337. Degraded by Theodora—appeals to Justinian, 338. Returns to Rome—his banishment and death, 339.

Silvester, Pope, i. 56. Donation of Constantine to, 57.

Silvester II. *See* Gerbert.

Simeon Stylites applied to by Theodosius, i. 173. His sanctity, 228. Death and funeral at Antioch, 229.

Simon de Montfort takes the Cross, iv. 132. At Zara, 140. Leaves the army, 144. Leads Crusade against heretics, 209. Invested with conquered lands, 212. His power, 219. His character, 220. Takes Lavaur, 222. His sovereignty, 223. Gains victory at Muret, 225. Chosen King of Languedoc — reaction against—war with young Raymond, 233. Suppresses risings in Toulouse, 234. Besieges Toulouse—is slain, 235.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, excommunicated, v. 59. His death—a popular saint, 69.

Simon of Tournay, vi. 444.

Simony, measures against, iii. 4. Prevalence of, 9. Caused by wealth and power of Church, 106. Tends to impoverish the Church, 107. Papal, vi. 35.

Simplicius, Pope at extinction of Roman Empire, i. 225. Remonstrates against Acacius, 235. Death of, 236.

Siricius, Pope, issues the first Decretal, i. 75.

Sixtus, Pope, i. 176.

Slavery recognised by Justinian, i. 360. Regulations concerning—previous mitigations of, 361. Under barbaric laws, 387. Gradually changed to serfdom, 391.

Slaves, their life and person protected—marriages of, i. 362. Trade in, was legal, 363. Marriages of under Barbaric law, 388. Their lives unprotected, 389. Runaway—emancipation of, i. 390.

Slavian language used in churches, ii. 427.

Soissons, election of Pepin at, ii. 235. Council of, condemns Abélard, iii. 365. Council of, iv. 73.

Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem, capitulates to Mohammedans, ii. 41. Resists Monotheletism, 125.

Spain, unsettled state of in 5th century, i. 105. Monasticism in, 413. Converted from Arianism, 445-447. And France, birth-place of chivalry, iii. 252. Innocent III.'s measures in, iv. 112. Affairs of (time of Clement IV.), v. 73. Acquittal of Templars in, 353. Church in, vi. 390.

Spanish Bishops among the Lapsi, i. 54.

Spectacles at Rome under Theodoric, i. 299.

Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, his crusade in Flanders, vi. 133.

Spires, Diet at, v. 384, 462.

Spiritualists, v. 416. Prophecies of, 417, 421. Avow the 'Eternal Gospel,' 419. Followers of Cœlestine V., 420. Persecuted by John XXII., 437. For Emperor against Pope, 458.

SQUINO.

Squino di Florian professes to tell secrets of Templars, v. 295. His monstrous charges, 296.

'*Stabat* Mater,' vi. 491.

States General. *See* Parliament, French.

Statues in churches, vi. 595. Destroyed by Crusaders, 597.

Statutes of Toulouse, iv. 239.

Stephania, widow of Crescentius, poisons Otho III., ii. 497.

Stephen, Pope, his dispute with Cyprian—with Firmilian, i. 53. His lenity to Spanish Bishops, 54.

Stephen II., Pope, treats with Astolph, ii. 238. Applies for aid to Constantinople—sets out for France, 239. Is met by Prince Charles, 240. Obtains promise of aid against Lombards, 240. Anoints Pepin and his sons, 241. Attacked in Rome by Astolph, 242. His letters to Pepin, 243.

Stephen III., Pope, cruelties at his election, ii. 250. Factions in his Popedom, 252. Supported by Lombards, 253. Remonstrates against Charlemagne's marriage, 255.

Stephen IV., Pope, flies from Rome, ii. 314. Crowns Louis the Pious at Rheims, 315.

Stephen V., Pope, ii. 410.

Stephen VI., Pope, insults remains of Formosus, ii. 414. Strangled in prison, 415.

Stephen IX. (Frederick of Lorraine), iii. 35. Flies from Henry III., 41. Restored by Pope Victor II.—Abbot of Monte Casino, 43. Pope, his high language at Constantinople, 44. Denounces Patriarch, 45. His plans against Normans, and death, 46.

Stedinger, heresy of, iv. 374.

Stephen, war of with Matilda, iii. 440.

Stephen, St., King of Hungary, iii. 29.

Stephen, the monk, denounces Iconoclasm, ii. 175. Imprisoned and murdered, 176.

Stigand, Saxon Archbishop, deposed by William the Conqueror, iii. 437.

'*Stigmata*' of St. Francis, iv. 272.

Stilicho defeats Alaric, i. 94, and Rhadagaisus—his disgrace and death, 96. His memory blackened—Consequences of his death, 97.

Strasburg, religious contests in, vi. 555. Resistance to Pope in, 558.

Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, vi. 98.

Straw, Jack, vi. 125.

Sturmi, a follower of St. Boniface, journey of, ii. 116. Founds monastery at Fulda, 117.

Subiaco, monasteries of, i. 418.

Subsidies of clergy, i. 184.

Subsidies to Mendicants, vi. 376.

Succession, principles of, unsettled, ii. 234.

Sudbury, Simon de, Archbishop, beheaded by insurgents, vi. 125.

Suffrage, right of at Councils, vi. 180.

Suger, of St. Denys, minister of French Kings, iii. 403. His early life, 404. Regent of France—his death, 406.

'*Sum* of Theology,' vi. 460.

Supino, Reginald di, attacks Pope Boniface VIII. at Anagni, v. 260. Collects witnesses, 364.

Supremacy of Emperor over Church, i. 353. Of barbarian kings, 354. Spiritual and

TEMPLARS.

Feudal, v. 232, 240. Of Roman Church. *See* Roman Church.

Sweden, Christianity in, ii. 437. Partial conversion of, 438.

Symbolism of Gothic architecture, vi. 593.

Symmachus, heathen orator. i. 135.

Symmachus, son of the above, Prefect of Rome, i. 135.

Symmachus, Pope, strife at his election, i. 253, 303. His invective against Emperor Anastasius, 254. Confirmed by Theodoric, 303. Accusations against, 304. Acquitted, 307. Death of, 308.

Symmachus, chief of the Senate, i. 324. Put to death by Theodoric, 325.

Syria becomes Mohammedan, ii. 39. Easy conquest of, 42.

Syrian Bishops, at Ephesus, i. 165. Condemn proceedings of Cyril and the majority, 166. At Chalcedon, 170. Synods of, 173. Their treaty with Cyril, 174. Resist John of Antioch, 176.

Syrgpulus, vi. 274.

T.

Tagus, Battle of, vi. 250.

Tabor, in Bohemia, vi. 340.

'*Taborites*,' vi. 246, 248, 341.

'*Tacitus* compared with Dante, vi. 514.

Tagliacozzo, battle of, v. 78.

Talleyrand, Cardinal, v. 547.

Tanchelin of Antwerp, iv. 179.

Tancred, of Sicily, his war with Henry VI., iii. 547. Releases Empress Constantia, 548. Death of, 550.

Tarasius, Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 183. His designs in favour of image-worship, 184.

Tarsus, Synod of, i. 173.

Tassilo, his meditated revolt, ii. 265. Imprisoned in a monastery, 304.

Tauler, John, vi. 554. His preaching, 556. German writings, 558. Death, 559. Sermons, 560.

Taxation of clergy, iv. 311.

Templars, abuse their privileges, iv. 123. Oppose Frederick II. in Palestine, 335. Origin and history of, v. 286. Their privileges and immunities, 287. Their independence and rivalry with Knights of St. John, 288. Their vices, 289. Retain power after loss of Palestine, 290. Wealth of, 293. Accusations against, 295. (In France) Monstrous charges against, 296. Sudden arrest of, 297. Trial by torture, 300. Confessions, 301. Questions put to, 304. Arrest of in England, 307. In Naples, 308. Jealousy of, 310. Examined by Pope Clement V., 313. Cited before Commissioners at Paris, 318. Brought from the Provinces, 323. Asked if they will defend the Order—their replies, 324. Proceedings of court against, 325, 330. Treated as relapsed heretics, 332. Many burned to death, 334. Burned in the provinces, 335. Confessions, 337. Result of confessions, 338. Arrest of in England and Scotland, 341. Examination in England, 342. Nothing proved against the Order, 343. Witnesses

against, 344. Strange evidence, 345-348. Confessing witnesses, 349. Sentences upon in England—examination of in Scotland and Ireland, 351. In Italy, 352. In Spain, 353. In Germany, their protest and acquittal—difficulty of question of their guilt, 354. Evidence against worthless, 356. Charges against improbable, 357. Were sacrificed for their wealth, 359. Their lands given to Hospitallers, 360. The Order abolished, 361. Abolition confirmed at Council of Vienne, 380. Commission on great dignitaries of, 395.

Temple at Paris, v. 292, 293.

Tenants of Church lands, vi. 374.

Tenths, levied by Gregory XI., v. 564.

Termes, capture of, iv. 217.

Tertiaries, Dominican, iv. 258. Franciscan, 271.

Tertullian, the first great Christian writer in Latin, i. 30. Adopts Montanism, 39.

Teutonic character, i. 257. Was congenial to Christianity, 258.

Teutonic Christianity, i. 9. Asserts individual responsibility, 10. Tendencies of, vi. 632. Its future, 633.

Teutonic Empire. *See* Empire.

Teutonic languages, vi. 527. Religious terms derived from, 528.

Teutonic Nations, their religion, i. 258. Their human sacrifices, 260. Which were common to all the tribes—animal sacrifices, 261.

Teutonic order, v. 402. Origin of, 403. Its crusades in North of Germany, 404. Its sovereignty, 405.

Teutonic painting, vi. 618.

Teutonic rulers of Gaul, vi. 520.

Teutonism, improves Roman morals, i. 283. Exceptions to this, 286. Disappears in France, vi. 521. Opposed to Roman unity, 533. In Germany, 550. Its independence, 630. Subjective, 631.

Teutons, rapid conversion of, i. 257. Their sacred groves, 261. Belief in a future state, their priests, 262. Prophetesses—encounter Christianity, 263. Respect Roman civilization and the clergy, 265. Converted by captives, 267. Blend their previous notions with Christianity, 268. Their successive conversion—Arianism, 269. Effects of their conversion, 282. Their continence, 284, 285. Their ferocity and licentiousness in Gaul, 286. Become corrupted by success, 288. Make Christianity barbarous, 289. Christianized from Rome, ii. 118.

Thaddeus of Suessa, Emperor's envoy at Lyons, iv. 430. His speech, 431. Courageous defence of Frederick II., 432. Taken and slain before Parma, 447.

Thegan, historian of Louis the Pious, denounces the low-born clergy, ii. 330.

Theobald, Archbishop, iii. 440. Patron of young Becket, 446. Supports Henry II., 447. Dies, 452.

Theocracy of Gregory VII., iii. 201.

Theudelinda, Queen of Lombards, i. 458.

Theutisc, adviser of Innocent III., iv. 215.

Theodora, Empress, her profligacy—influence of, i. 329. Interferes in religion, 330. Supports Anthemius, 337. Death of, 341.

Theodora, Empress of Theophilus, ii. 200. Her secret image-worship, 201. Empress, 202.

Theodora (of Rome), her vices, influence in disposal of Papacy, ii. 451. Appoints John X., 453.

Theodore Lascaris, iv. 158.

Theodoric, his war with Odoacer, i. 293. King of Italy, 294. Endeavours to unite races—his Roman ministers, 295. Division of lands, 296. Encourages agriculture—peace and security of his reign, 297. His public works, 298. Liberality, 299. Exhibits spectacles, 299, 304. His toleration, 300. Impartiality—treats Catholic clergy with respect, 301. His gifts to the Church, 302. Decides contested Papal election, 303. His visit to Rome, 304. Review of his situation, 315. Extent of his power, 316. Conspiracies against—protects Jews, 317. Disarms Roman population—state of his family—danger of his kingdom, 318. Correspondence with Emperor Justin, 320. Urges toleration of Arians—sends Pope John ambassador to Constantinople, 321. Imprisons him on his return, 323. Puts to death Boethius, 324, and Symmachus—the latter years of his reign, 325. Appoints Felix Pope—his death, 326. Tales of his remorse and fate after death—his tomb at Ravenna, 327. His laws Roman, 378.

Theodorus, Pope, anathematises Pyrrhus, ii. 130.

Theodorus, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 83. Supersedes Wilfrid, 84. His remorse and death, 87. Founds a Greek school at Canterbury, 91.

Theodosius II., i. 141. Favours Nestorius—rebukes Cyril, 156. Summons Council at Ephesus, 157. His rescripts, 168. Summons Council at Chalcedon, 169. Invokes aid of St. Simeon Stylites, 173. Death of, 207.

Theodotus, marries and puts to death Amalasuntha, i. 333. His embassy to Constantinople, 335. His threats, 335.

Theology and Metaphysics, iii. 358.

Theology, monastic, vi. 435. And philosophy, 437, 475. Popular, 625.

Theophilus, son of Michael, his marriage, ii. 196. Character, 197. Magnificence, 198. Persecutes image-worshippers, 199. Wars with the Saracens, 200.

Theotgand, Archbishop of Treves, ii. 364. Accompanies Gunther of Cologne in exile, 365.

Theutberga, Queen of Lothair II., divorced, ii. 364. Reinstated by Papal legate, 370. Prays for dissolution of marriage, 371, 382.

Thierri, King of Burgundy, his vices, ii. 103. Banishes St. Columban, 105.

Thomas, Christian governor of Damascus, defeat of, ii. 40.

Thomists and Scotists, vi. 469.

Thorpe, William, vi. 147.

Thuringia, visited by S. Boniface, ii. 111.

Timotheus Ailurus, i. 227. Rules Emperor Basiliscus, 231.

Timotheus, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 245.
Tithes granted by Charlemagne, ii. 292. Original institution of, vi. 365.
Titles, ecclesiastical, were Latin, vi. 534.
Tivoli, war of with Rome—spared by Innocent II., iii. 391.
Toledo, council of, i. 446.
Torture continued under Justinian, i. 375. Applied to Templars, v. 300.
Tonsure, question of in England, ii. 71.
Totila takes Rome, i. 345. Visits St. Benedict, 423.
Toto seizes Papacy, ii. 249.
Toulouse, Henry II.'s war in, iii. 450. Counts of, iv. 190. Bishopric of, 196. Count Raymond of, 198. Supports Count Raymond, 219. Civil war in, 220. Surrendered to Simon de Montfort, 227. Rises against de Montfort—betrayed by Bishop, 234. Admits Count Raymond—siege of, 235. Statutes of, 239. Inquisition of, v. 16.
Tours, wealth and importance of, i. 202. Battle of, ii. 214. Council of, iii. 457.
Tracy, William de, iii. 519.
Trajan, persecution by, i. 27.
Transalpine architecture, vi. 565.
Translations from the Greek, vi. 351.
Transubstantiation, term first used, iii. 21. Question of renewed by Berengar, 183. Its importance to sacerdotal power, 184. Wycliffe's opinions on, vi. 131. Huss questioned upon, 202.
Trial by battle, i. 396.
Tribonian, a reputed atheist, i. 360.
Tribur, Diet at, iii. 161. Its declaration against Henry IV., 163.
Tribute, English to Rome, discussion on, vi. 107.
Trinitarian controversy, i. 60, 61.
Trinity, Abélard's treatise on, iii. 365.
Troubadours, iv. 192. Priestly, vi. 508.
Trouvères, vi. 489. Northern, 524.
Truce of God, iii. 253. Proclaimed at Rheims, 311.
Turan Shah, Sultan of Egypt, captor of St. Louis, v. 12. Murdered, 13.
Turks, masters of Jerusalem—persecute pilgrims, iii. 228. Victories of, vi. 266. Take Constantinople, 347.
Tuscany, Marquisate of, ii. 449. Invaded by Henry IV., iii. 194. Disputed succession to, 298, 535, 540.
Tusculum, Counts of, their power in Papal elections, ii. 501. Enmity with Rome, iii. 531. Dismantled by Alexander III., and refortified, 534.
Twelfth century, epochs in, iii. 259. Review of—its great men, 260.
Twenge, Robert, resists Roman claims, iv. 310. Carries remonstrances to Rome, 398.
"*Type*" of Emperor Constans, ii. 130. Condemned by Pope Martin I., 131.
Tyrol, Æneas Sylvius in, vi. 321.

U, V.

Vacancies, vi. 226.
Valentinian, Emperor, i. 67. Confirms appeals to Roman Church, 89.

Valentinian III. supports Leo the Great, i. 195. Flies to Rome from Attila, 215. Murdered, 217.
Valla, Laurentius, vi. 350.
Valois, house of, its power, 309, 383. Fall of, 412.
Vandals conquer Africa, i. 189. Sack Rome, 219.
Van Eycks, the, vi. 618.
Vatican built, v. 96. Library, vi. 350, 353.
Venetians, undertake conveyance of Crusaders, iv. 134. Their terms, 136. At Zara, 140. Excommunicated, 143. Disregard excommunication, 144. Divide churches of Constantinople with Franks, 150. Appoint the Patriarch, 151. Their address to Pope, 152.
Venice, truce of, iii. 535. Rise of, iv. 135. Advantages secured by, 163. Was not an archiepiscopal seat, 164. Her commerce—imports—works of art, 166. Under Interdict, v. 385. Receives Greek Emperor and Patriarch, vi. 275. Doge of, his advice to Greek Emperor, 276. Jealous of the Church, 387. St. Mark's at, 572.
Vercelli, Council of, iii. 25. Cathedral of, vi. 589.
Vernacular languages and poetry, iv. 247. Literature, anti-sacerdotal, vi. 508.
Vespasian, tablet of, v. 517.
Vespers, Sicilian, v. 111.
Vezelay, church and monastery of, iii. 487.
Ugo Falcodi. *See* Clement IV.
Ugolino, Cardinal. *See* Gregory IX.
Vicenza, John of, a friar preacher, iv. 406. His sermon near Verona, 407. His political conduct, 408.
Victor, St., Hugo de, mysticism of, vi. 439.
Victor, Pope, i. 35. Favours Praxeas, 39.
Victor II. (Gebhard of Eichstadt), his influence with Henry III., iii. 39. Reluctant acceptance of Papacy, 40. Holds council at Florence—attempt on his life, 41. Present at death of Henry III.—made guardian to his son, 42. His power and death, 43.
Victor III., Pope (Desiderius), his election, iii. 203. His reluctance, 204. Flies from Rome, 205. Resumes Pontificate, 206. Holds council at Benevento, 207. Anathematizes Guibert—death of, 208.
Victor IV., Antipope, iii. 423. His death, 433.
Vienne, Council of, excommunicates Henry V., iii. 296; Council of, v. 378. Abolishes Order of Templars, 380. Declares innocence of Boniface VIII., 381. Acts of, 382.
Vigilius, his compact with Theodora, i. 338. Pope—embraces Eutychianism, 339. At Constantinople—hated by Romans, 340. His absence fortunate, 341. His vacillation, 341, 342. His sufferings, 343. Submission to Justinian, and death, 344.
Villehardouin, concludes treaty with Venetians, iv. 134.
Vineâ, Peter de, Chancellor of Emperor Frederick II., iv. 449. His disgrace and death, 450.
Virgin Mary, worship of, i. 140. Its origin, 141. Importance of, 467. Deified, vi. 400. Head of saints, 413. Extravagant

worship of, 415. Immaculate conception of, 416.

Visconti, Matteo, v. 449. Excommunicated, 451. His death, 452.

Visconti, Galeazzo, captures Papal general, v. 454. Excommunicated, 455. His quarrel with Louis of Bavaria, 468. His death, 477.

Visconti, Gian Galeazzo, vi. 34. His power and ambition, 41. His death, 42.

Viscontis in Milan, v. 387, 555. Intermarry with France and England, 556. Ineffectual crusade against, 557. Their power, 563.

Visigoth law, i. 380, 395. Against heresy, 381.

Visigoth kings supreme over Church, i. 383.

Vitalianus, revolt of, i. 247. Supported by Pope Hormisdas, 247. Murdered by Justinian, 314.

Vitalianus, Pope, ii. 134. His reception of Emperor Constans—his dispute with Ravenna, 135.

Vitelleschi, John, vi. 261.

Viterbo, subdued by Innocent III., iv. 15. Hostility of Rome to, 376. Expels Imperialists, 420. Papal residence, v. 53, 54.

Vivian, Papal legate, iii. 502, 506.

Ulphilas, parentage of—Bishop of the Goths—his embassy to Valens, i. 270. Becomes head of a Christian community—translates the Scriptures, 272.

Ultramontane cardinals, vi. 12.

Unity of Church under Justinian, i. 328.

Universities, rise of, v. 42. English, vi. 100.

University of Paris. *See* Paris.

Urban II. (Otto), Bishop of Ostia, is nearly elected Pope, iii. 204. Elected at Terracina, 209. Comes to Rome, and retires, 210. His poverty, 215. Holds council at Piacenza, 215. Visits France, 217. Acknowledged by English Church, 220. Excommunicates Philip I., 221. His interview with Peter the Hermit, 230. Holds Council of Clermont, 231. His speech, 232.

Urban III., Pope, Archbishop of Milan, iii. 540. Refuses to crown Prince Henry, 541. Strife with Emperor Frederick—story of his death, 542.

Urban IV., election of, v. 53. Early history—appoints French cardinals, 54. His situation, 55. Offers crown of Naples to St. Louis, 56. To Charles of Anjou, 57. Supports Henry III. against barons, 58, 59. His league with Charles of Anjou, 60 His death, 61.

Urban V., his reforms, v. 554. Excommunicates Bernabo Visconti, 556. Petrarch's appeal to, 558. His voyage to Rome, 559. His amity with Emperor, 560. His return to Avignon, and death, 561.

Urban VI., his election, vi. 7. His character, 9. Condemns luxury of Cardinals, 10. His imperiousness, 11. Cardinals declare against, 12. His imprudent acts, 13. Creates twenty-six Cardinals, 14. His acts, 18. Successes, 19. Hostility to Queen Joanna, 20. At Naples, 22. Persecutes opponents, 23. Quarrels with Charles III. of Naples, 24. Arrests Cardinals at Nocera, 25. His cruelties to Cardinals, 26. Escapes to Genoa, 27. Proclaims Jubilee, 29. His death and alleged madness, 30.

Ursicinus, rival of Damasus, i. 68, 69.

Utraquists, vi. 248.

Vulgate, its merits and influence, i. 74. Completed by Jerome at Bethlehem, 75. Discredit of, vi. 624.

W.

Waggons, Hussite, vi. 250.

Wala, grandson of Charles Martel, ii. 312. Becomes a monk, 313. Favours rebellion of Bernhard—disgraced by Louis the Pious, 319. Recalled to court—his influence over Louis, 321. His mission to Rome, 323. Joins in rebellion of Louis' sons, 326, 330. His death, 336.

Waldenses revere Arnold of Brescia, iii. 390. At Rome, iv. 183. Their translation of Scriptures, 185. Their teachers, 238.

Waldo, Peter, iv. 181, 183.

Waldrada, concubine of Lothair II., ii. 364. Made Queen, 365. Excommunicated by Nicolas I., 371. Restored to communion by Hadrian II., 382.

Wallace, William, v. 203.

Walter of Brienne, iv. 26. Commands forces of Innocent III.—defeats Germans before Capua, 27. His death, 28.

Walter of Troja, Papal chancellor, defeats Markwald, iv. 26. Jealous of Walter of Brienne—intrigues with Markwald, 27.

War, results of on clergy, v. 182.

Wat Tyler, vi. 124.

Wearmouth, monastery of, founded, ii. 81.

Wenceslaus, Emperor, vi. 12.

Wenzel, Prince and Saint of Bohemia, ii. 428.

Wenzel (Wenceslaus), King of Bohemia, vi. 164. Favours Huss, 164. His death, 246.

Werner, favourite of Henry IV., iii. 77, 80.

Wessex, conversion of, ii. 67.

Western Church, its emancipation caused by Mohammedanism, ii. 203. And by other causes, 204.

Western churches, vi. 573.

Western Empire. *See* Empire.

Western Monasticism contrasted with Eastern, i. 409. Its character, 410. Early, in Italy, 412. In Gaul, 413. In Spain, 413. In Britain, 414. Extreme notions of on celibacy, 422.

Westminster, Parliament at, iii. 462.

Whitby, Synod at, ii. 71.

Widekind, Saxon chief, ii. 284.

Wilfrid, his early history, travels to Lyons, ii. 74. To Rome, 75. Returns to Northumbria, consecrated Bishop, 76. Adventure with Sussex pirates—Bishop of York, 77. Builds churches at York, Ripon, 80, and Hexham, 81. His reverses, 82. Superseded—appeals to Pope—thrown on coast of Friesland—at Rome, 84. In Sussex, 85. Founds monastery of Selsey—converts Ceadwalla, 86. Restored to York, 87. His expulsion, 88. Second journey to Rome, 89. His death, 90.

WILHELMINA.

Wilhelmina, her gospel, v. 422. Her heresy overlooked, 423.

William I. of England, supported by Pope, iii. 420. Refuses fealty, 421. Makes Lanfranc Primate—deposes Saxon prelates, 437. His respect for Lanfranc, 438.

William Rufus, his cupidity restrained by Lanfranc, iii. 438. Makes Anselm Archbishop, 439.

William of Holland, anti-Emperor, iv. 445. His death, v. 30.

William, Bishop of Utrecht, iii. 150. Excommunicates Gregory VII.—his sudden death, 156.

William, King of Sicily, his alliance with Hadrian IV., iii. 417.

William of Pavia, Legate of Alexander III., iii. 492.

William, S., Archbishop of York, iii. 396.

William of Castres, Albigonsian, iv. 238.

Willis, Professor, vi. 590.

Winchelsea, Robert of, Primate, resists Edward I., v. 190. His estates seized, but restored, 192.

Witchcraft, laws against, i. 398. Ascribed to evil spirits, vi. 411.

Witiges, King of Goths in Italy, i. 333.

Woden compared with Mercury by the Romans, i. 259.

Wood, [illegible]ous sculpture in, vi. 603.

[illegible] expectation of [illegible]

World's end, ex[illegible] 488.

Worms, Synod of, iii. 149. Concordat of, 319.

Writings, anti-papal, v. 463, 467.

Wulstan of Worcester, iii. 437.

Wurtzburg, treaty of, iii. 318. Diet of, 483.

Wycliffe, his birth, vi. 100. At Oxford, 103. His early writings, 104. Attacks Mendicants, 105. His preferments, 106. Professorship, 109. Embassy to Bruges, 110. Summoned to St. Paul's, 117. Papal proceedings against, 120. His reply to articles, 121. His translation of Scripture, 123. Endangered by insurrection of peasants, 126. His tenets condemned, 127. His petition, 129. His defence at Oxford, 130. His doctrines condemned—retires to Lutterworth, 131. His death, 134. His works, 135, and doctrines, 136. His books burned at Prague, 167. Represents University, 536. His Bible, 545.

Wyclifite teachers, vi. 122. Martyrs, 144, 147.

Wykeham, William, of, vi. 109. Impeached, 116. Restitution of, 117.

Wyschebrad, battle of, vi. 247.

X.

Xenaras (or Philoxenus), disturbs Syria, i. 242.

Y.

York, see of, founded, ii. 65. Church at, 80.

Z.

Zabarella, Cardinal, at Constance, vi. 174, 193. Draws form of recantation for Huss, 207.

Zacharias, Pope, ii. 227. His interview with Liutprand, 228. Obtains peace, 229. His second interview—saves the remains of Empire in Italy, 230. Sanctions election of Pe[illegible]35. Claims grounded on this act, 236.

Zara, siege and capture of, iv. 140. Crusaders winter at, 144. Venetian Archbishop of, 164. Rejected by Pope, 165.

Zengis Khan ravages Eastern Europe, iv. 415.

Zeno, Emperor, expelled by Basiliscus, i. 230. Reinstated, 231. Issues the Henoticon, 232.

Zephyrinus, Pope, i. 43.

Ziani, Doge of Venice, iv. 164.

Ziska, victories of, vi. 248.

Zosimus, Pope, i. 121. Declares Pelagius and Celestius orthodox, 123. Retracts, 125. Death of, 133. His conduct in case of Apianus, 188. Rebuked by African Church 189.

Zurich, Arnold of Brescia at, iii. 388.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET, AND CHARING CROSS.

Digitized with financial assistance from

Government of Maharashtra

on 30 January, 2020

00068291